

IN Part B

FFY2015 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments			
	File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.			

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

380

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The Indiana State Education Agency (SEA) is located within the Indiana Department of Education/Division of Student Achievement and Improvement and is the Office of Special Education (IDOE/OSE). The Department offers support to IDOE/OSE through ancillary divisions such as Finance and Business Operations, Communications, General Counsel, Government and Public Affairs and School Support Services. Please visit the Indiana website at <http://www.doe.in.gov/> for additional information. IDOE/OSE is strengthening relationships between various divisions through work on the State Systemic Improvement Plan (Indicator 17). The Every Student Succeeds Act has recently been passed and the IDOE/OSE looks forward to ongoing involvement in the implementation of the Act to ensure excellence and equity for students with disabilities in Indiana.

The IDOE/OSE has eighteen dedicated staff members that provide general supervision to the state. Staff includes:

Administration

Director (1)

Assistant Director (1)

Administrative Support Specialist (1)

Due Process Team

Due Process Coordinator/Attorney (1)

Complaint Investigator (3)

Due Process Support Specialist (1)

Fiscal Team

Part B Grants Supervisor (1)

Contract Manager (1)

Medicaid Specialist (1)

Excess Cost Supervisor (1)

Excess Cost Support Specialist (1)

Monitoring Team

Education Specialist (4)

Data Manager (1)

As a result of a long and productive working relationship with the Parent Training and Information Center, IDOE is one of a few states, if not the only state, that provides office space for a staff member from IN*SOURCE, which helps to facilitate a close working relationship between the two entities. The IN*SOURCE staff member is an integral part of IDOE/OSE, attending IDOE/OSE staff meetings and is asked to speak to family members who call in with questions.

Following the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), corresponding regulations, and, Article 7, (Indiana's special education rules), IDOE/OSE personnel are to ensure that students with disabilities are provided a free appropriate public education (FAPE) so they can be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum.

The IDOE/OSE 'system of general supervision' is a cohesive, coordinated set of the activities described below. It is important to note that though personnel have an assigned 'area of responsibility,' work is not done in isolation. Staff work closely with one another as each is dependent upon the others for updates, sharing of information, and communication of issues that impact the entire office. The IDOE/OSE routinely engages in cross-training Due Process, Monitoring and Fiscal staff, involving individuals from each in the ongoing/routine work of the others' program areas. For example, each of the due process, fiscal and monitoring staff members are also leading project teams, answer general inquiries on a rotational basis, serve on or providing administrative support for councils and Boards and assisting with review processes during peak times.

Staff work in partnership with other offices and divisions within the department including:

Superintendent of Public Instruction	Early Learning & Intervention
Deputy Superintendent	Title Programs

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Government & Public Affairs

College & Career Readiness

Communications

eLearning

Information Technology

School Support Services

Legal Affairs

Student Services

Finance & Business Operations

School & Community Nutrition

Outreach & School Improvement

Licensing

Grants Management

Assessment

Staff also work closely with other state agencies that provide support for students with disabilities including:

Department of Health

Family and Social Services Administration including divisions listed below:

Department of Workforce Development

*First Steps

Indiana School for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ISBVI)

*Division of Disabilities and Rehab Services

Indiana School for the Deaf (ISD)

*Vocational Rehabilitation Services

Department of Correction

*Office of Early Childhood and Out of School Learning

Office of the Attorney General

*Department of Child Services

Department of Administration

*Division of Family Resources

State Board of Education

*Office of Medicaid Policy and Planning

State Budget Agency

Division of Mental Health and Addiction

State Board of Accounts

*Division of Contracts Management

Legislative Services Agency

*Division of Financial Management

GENERAL SUPERVISION COMPONENTS

For the purposes of this document Indiana is using a modified version of the guidance that OSEP offered in the Regional Implementation Meetings - Building the Legacy: IDEA 2004, "*Concepts of General Supervision*." Indiana has identified eight components of general supervision which will be discussed in detail later in this introduction:

State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation Integrated Monitoring Activities Fiscal Management Data on Processes and Results Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions Effective Dispute Resolution Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development.

1) State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The current SPP is effective from FFY2013 through FFY2018. The SPP describes each of the 17 federal indicators and provides a target for each. Each indicator is categorized as either 'compliance' (the target is 100% or 0%, depending upon the indicator) or 'results' (the target is set by IDOE/OSE based on trend analysis and stakeholder input). Some are measured by a statewide number, others include a compilation of local education agency (LEA) information, i.e. the percentage of LEAs that meet the target.

Submitted to OSEP each year, the APR reflects the performance of Indiana LEAs based upon data collected per indicator and includes the findings made, allowing a year for correction by LEAs that did not meet the targets set for specific indicators. See "Integrated Monitoring Activities," below for a description of data collection.

The SPP and APR are posted on the IDOE <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/monitoring>.

2) Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

The Indiana special education rules are promulgated in the Indiana Administrative Code at 511 IAC 7-32, 7-49. This rule is commonly known as "Article 7," and there is an agency version that includes a table of contents and an index for reader reference.

"Navigating the Course: Finding your way through Indiana's Special Education Rules" was written to provide an overview and a practical resource to help parents, advocates, school personnel, and students understand the requirements of Indiana's special education rules, Article 7.

When questions arise as local programs implement Article 7, necessary clarification is provided by the Director of Special Education, and this guidance/clarification is included through the Question/Answer Section of the "From the Director" newsletter and is posted on the "Learning Connection," which is the IDOE on-line resource for education stakeholders. In addition to the various learning communities found on the Learning Connection Website, users can also find curriculum resources, academic standards, and post questions and/or suggestions. The Learning Connection is available as a resource not just to Special Education Directors, but to parents, teachers- both general and special education, building principals, Superintendents and any other education stakeholder.

Article 7 and Navigating the Course are aligned with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and are implemented by local programs, including LEAs and state-run programs. The documents are referenced by IDOE/OSE personnel when providing technical assistance in calls and emails from the general public and both serve as the basis of any technical assistance and training offered through IDOE/OSE.

3) Integrated Monitoring Activities

Annually, the IDOE/OSE makes a determination whether LEAs meet the requirements and purposes of IDEA Part B, which is reflected in Article 7. The IDOE/OSE makes this determination based upon data collected throughout the year and compares it to the indicator targets in the SPP, information obtained through LEA monitoring activities, and any other publicly available information. IDOE/OSE categorizes each LEA as:

- 1) Meets Requirements and purposes of Part B of IDEA;
- 2) Needs Assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of IDEA;
- 3) Needs Intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of IDEA; or
- 4) Needs Substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B of the Act.

Depending upon the LEA determination, IDOE/OSE may offer technical assistance/training, require a corrective action plan to resolve the root cause issue(s), and/or put special conditions on funds of an LEA. LEA determinations are posted on the IDOE/OSE's public website.

IDOE/OSE conducts various monitoring activities that focus on improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities, and ensuring that LEAs and other educational programs meet the 10/31/2017

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

program requirements under Part B of the IDEA. IDOE/OSE conducts monitoring activities through the collection and analysis of data that the LEAs submit throughout the year. These data are compared to the compliance targets as defined in the SPP. There are seventeen specific indicators, tied to three overarching themes, that are the cornerstones to Part B of IDEA:

- 1) Provision of a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment;
- 2) The IDOE/OSE exercise of general supervision, including child find, effective monitoring, the use of resolution meetings, mediation, and a system of transition services; and
- 3) Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services, to the extent the representation is the result of inappropriate identification of the student with a disability.

The IDOE/OSE Monitoring Team members are each responsible to monitor LEA compliance with/results for specific indicators found in the SPP. Depending upon how the information is reported in the APR, the team members analyze either LEA data or statewide data. The data for each LEA is reviewed once every three years on three compliance indicators (B-11, B-12, and B-13). All LEAs are reviewed annually for the other compliance indicators (B-4, B-9, and B-10). In addition, all noncompliance identified through Indiana's effective dispute resolution process must be corrected as soon as possible and no later than one year after the noncompliance has been identified.

As the LEA information becomes available from IDOE data collections, the members of the team review the data for completeness and work with the individual LEAs as necessary to make sure the data was accurately submitted. In some cases, for example the disproportionality indicators, the data is sent to a vendor who is responsible for clean-up, analysis, and synthesis of the data. The data is then compared to the targets identified in the SPP. Some information submitted by an LEA for compliance indicators are determined to meet the targets based strictly on data, i.e., did the identification of a student's eligibility for special education occur within the state identified timelines. However, other compliance decisions take additional factors into account before determining if there is a finding of noncompliance. Depending upon the indicator, in addition to an analysis of the data, a team member may look at LEAs policies, procedures and practices as part of the noncompliance decision.

Letters are sent to LEAs specifying whether they are in compliance with the applicable indicators or failed to meet compliance requirements. If an LEA is out of compliance, it must determine the root cause and develop a corrective action plan to address the reason(s) it is noncompliant. The designated IDOE/OSE education specialist provides assistance throughout the root cause identification and corrective action plan development then maintains regular contact with the LEA staff responsible for correction of the identified noncompliance. This regular contact is in the form of telephone calls, face to face visits as well as emails consisting of discussion about the issues, provision of technical assistance and identification of resources to assist with correction.

Using a two-pronged approach, education specialists are responsible to work with their assigned LEAs to verify that each incidence of noncompliance is corrected within the required timelines (Prong 1). For example, verification that Transition IEPs are developed during the appropriate timeframe and contain all required components. The education specialist is also responsible to review updated data to ensure that any systemic issues causing noncompliance are addressed (Prong 2). If it is discovered during these regular contacts that the LEA is not making sufficient progress in correcting noncompliance, more concentrated technical assistance is provided to ensure verification of correction during the required timeline. Once the correction has been verified the LEA is issued a letter documenting that the noncompliance has been corrected. If the LEA is unsuccessful in correcting noncompliance within the required timelines, the IDOE/OSE will impose the appropriate sanctions and/or enforcement.

4) Fiscal Management

IDOE/OSE is responsible for three fiscal management areas:

A) Distribution and monitoring of Federal Part B funds. The Part B grants consist of section 611 (students ages 3-21) and section 619 (students ages 3-5). The purpose of these funds is to pay the costs of providing special education and related services to students who are eligible for special education services. These funds are to supplement state, local and other federal funds. The IDOE/OSE team members provide intensive technical assistance to LEA personnel to ensure the funds are utilized and reported appropriately.

The funds are distributed through an application process which includes:

An LEA budget that is built upon allowable costs, e.g., personnel/benefits, equipment, purchased services, materials, etc.; Identification of a proportionate share of Part B funds that will be spent on equitable services for parentally-placed private school children with disabilities; Maintenance of Effort, which requires an LEA to spend at least the same amount per student as it did in the previous fiscal year on students with disabilities from state and local funds; Identification of Excess Costs, ensuring that an LEA can demonstrate that IDEA funds are used only for the excess costs that are required to provide FAPE to children with disabilities; Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS). CEIS can be a voluntary or mandated process by which an LEA may expend up to 15% of the LEA's total 611 and 619 Part B funds on students who have been identified as at risk for special education services. If an LEA has exceeded the Indiana defined bar for discipline, special education identification or least restrictive environment, the LEA is mandated to expend exactly 15% of its total 611 and 619 allocations on students who have not been identified as needing special education or related services but need academic and behavioral support to succeed in a general education environment.

IDOE/OSE personnel not only distribute Part B funds in accordance with federal requirements, they assure the funds are used in accordance with federal and state requirements, by providing oversight on the use of funds.

IDOE/OSE personnel monitor for the appropriate use of the Part B funds. For example, the proportionate share of Part B funds must be documented by the LEA through submitted reports that include an itemization of expenditures and costs. IDOE/OSE provides assistance to LEAs regarding maintenance of effort, clarifying that expenses should be consistent year to year, logically be connected to special education, and that expenses be tracked for audit purposes.

The IDOE/OSE staff monitor that the CEIS funds are spent appropriately. The LEA must itemize expenditures and costs, report the number of students receiving services through CEIS funding and the number of students eligible for special education services after receiving services during a reporting period, and a description of the activities implemented through use of the funds that will be sustained. The members of the fiscal team work closely with the monitoring team in this process.

IDOE/OSE utilizes a portion of the Part B funds for administrative support, including contracts to entities for the provision of technical assistance and professional develop to LEAs.

B) Medicaid reimbursement available for health-related services that schools provide to meet the educational needs of students with disabilities: IDOE/OSE has a Medicaid specialist who works with LEAs that claim Medicaid reimbursement for covered IEP-required services (e.g., physical therapy, speech therapy, nursing services, etc). The LEA is reimbursed at the Medicaid-allowable rate for these services, thereby recovering available federal funds pursuant to federal and state Medicaid and Education laws and rules. LEAs can also take advantage of Indiana's Medicaid Administrative Claiming opportunity, in which the participating LEA recovers a portion of its state and local costs for staff administrative activities to facilitate healthcare access for ALL students in the district.

C) Excess Cost Funding: IDOE/OSE personnel manage a state line item fund that can be accessed by the LEA to cover the excess costs of educating students whose disabilities are of such intensity as to preclude achievement in the existing local public school setting.

The LEA may access this fund using an application that justifies the school's inability to meet the student's extraordinary educational need without this funding. The application is primarily based upon the services that are identified in the IEP of the student, including consideration of least restrictive environment and includes detailed information about any private vendor and the costs of the service(s). The funding may pay for services that include, but are not limited to, the following:

- (a) A public or private residential program when services in a residential setting are necessary for the student to benefit from special education.
- (b) Nonresidential services necessary to enable the student to remain in the community without resorting to residential placement or to return to the local community from a residential placement.

The IDOE/OSE personnel administer the funding process from receipt of application to payment for services via a state contract with either a private vendor or directly with the LEA. The state contract regulations involve IDOE Finance Division and several other state agencies.

5) Data on Processes and Results

School and LEA staff prepare and submit data regarding students, personnel, and other required data via the IDOE STN Application Center and DOE Online. Public schools, including charter schools, and accredited nonpublic schools submit required data. There are various required data submissions during the school year, some of which are specific to special education students:

1. Child count
2. Personnel Educational environments
3. Student exiting information
4. Discipline Assessment
5. Dispute resolution

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The information is also used to complete the annual performance report required by OSEP, and as mentioned previously, used to discover LEA findings of noncompliance, and to make determinations.

Section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that each state submit data about children with disabilities, ages 3 through 21, who receive special education and related services under Part B of IDEA. This data includes:

Assessment

Child Count

Child Count and Educational Environments

Discipline

Dispute Resolution

Educational Environments

Exiting

Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services

Personnel

Data is used to inform all of the projects that IDOE/OSE is involved in. IDOE/OSE provides data to members of the general public, school personnel, State Board of Education, and legislators. Confidentiality laws are followed.

6) Improvement, Correction, Incentives and Sanctions

As stated earlier, IDOE/OSE personnel are to ensure that students with disabilities are provided a free appropriate public education (FAPE) so they can be involved and make progress in the general education curriculum. IDOE/OSE has the state authority to enforce regulations, policies and procedures to ensure LEA compliance. IDOE/OSE assists the LEA, through guidance, technical assistance and training, and in the correction of deficiencies that are identified through monitoring activities. If the LEA deficiencies persist, IDOE/OSE has a range of activities that may be utilized to assist in the correction. In the event the LEA does not correct noncompliance within one year, the IDOE/OSE considers imposing sanctions ranging from more intensive technical assistance to placing special conditions on the use of Part B funds.

As part of the dispute resolution process (see below) has elements of improvement, correction, incentives and sanctions.

A. Complaint Investigation: The complaint is submitted to the IDOE/OSE and a complaint investigator investigates the allegations then develops a report which reflects the identified issue(s), the findings of fact, conclusions, and corrective action, if any.

B) Mediation: is a voluntary and confidential process that provides a trained and impartial mediator to facilitate discussion between the parent(s) and school to help the parties resolve a disagreement. If the disagreement is resolved through mediation, the parties must put their agreement in a written agreement.

C) Due Process Hearing: At the conclusion of the hearing, the Independent Hearing Officer considers all of the information and issues a written decision.

If, through the process of compliance monitoring an LEA has a finding of non-compliance, the LEA must complete a Root Cause Analysis to determine the reason(s) for non-compliance. From that, the LEA must develop a Corrective Action Plan. The plan must then be implemented, and the non-compliance fixed within a year of the finding. If the non-compliance is not fixed within a year, the LEA has 'uncorrected' non-compliance, and if not fixed after the second year, the LEA goes into 'long standing' non-compliance. Findings as well as any continued non-compliance impacts the Determination score.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires the OSE to determine if each local educational agency (LEA) meets the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. Based on an LEA's score on a number of criteria based upon compliance indicators, the LEA is ranked in one of four categories of determination.

LEA DETERMINATION	CONSEQUENCE
Meets Requirements	No Action Needed by LEA
Needs Assistance	LEA works with OSE Consultant; provided with resources
Needs Intervention	LEA works with OSE Consultant; specific resource plan (TA/PD) developed that LEA must follow
Needs Substantial Intervention	Individually determined. In recent years Indiana has had one district with this determination, and they were placed on Special Conditions for their Part B grant.

IDOE has imposed Special Conditions on one Local Educational Agency's (LEA) for the grant award under Part B to ensure that the LEA General Supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) corrects noncompliance as required.

These special conditions were imposed because:

1. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements to evaluate and determine students eligible within 50 instructional days;
2. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for transition services;
3. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for discipline procedures;
4. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for disproportionality in suspensions and/or expulsions;
5. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for disproportionality in identification of students with disabilities based on race/ethnicity;
6. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for Least Restrictive Environment;
7. The failure of the LEA to implement requirements for Maintenance of Effort;
8. The failure of the LEA general supervision system to timely correct noncompliance; and
9. The failure of the LEA to provide an appropriately certified sign language interpreter.

7) Effective Dispute Resolution

The working relationship between the student with a disability, his or her family, and school personnel is generally positive as all parties work together to make decisions about the student's education. When there is a disagreement that cannot be worked out at the local level there are three conflict resolution options available:

A) A complaint, which can be filed by anyone, alleges that a school is not complying with: State/ federal special education or related requirements; A signed mediation agreement; A signed resolution agreement; or, A hearing officer's orders.

A complaint may involve one student or a group of students. The complaint is submitted to the IDOE/OSE and a complaint investigator investigates the allegations then develops a report which reflects the identified issue(s), the findings of fact, conclusions, and corrective action, if any.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

B) Mediation may be used on a voluntary basis to resolve any disagreements between a parent and the LEA, including those involved in complaints and due process hearings. All parties must agree to participate in mediation which is conducted by a trained mediator. The discussions are confidential, and the mediation agreement is legally binding.

C) Due process hearings involve an 'independent hearing officer'. The parent, 18 year old student, the school, or the IDOE may make a written request for a due process hearing. The process involves administrative proceedings similar to court, and the parties can be represented by counsel or non-attorney advocate. If the hearing was requested by the parent, the school is required to conduct a resolution session. The parties may agree to mediate in lieu of the resolution session. If the issue is not resolved or settled, a hearing will be conducted. The hearing officer makes a written decision, and there is an opportunity to appeal.

In addition to these three formal means of dispute resolution that are identified in Article 7, Indiana also offers facilitated IEP (FIEP) as a means to address concerns within the IEP team meeting, referred to, in Indiana, as the case conference committee (CCC). A trained facilitator is provided upon request and at no cost to the parties.

IDOE/OSE works with the LEAs, as well as the Parent Training and Information Center to ensure that parents receive and understand their rights and responsibilities.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

For purposes of this document 'technical assistance' is defined as the provision of advice and assistance in the implementation, installation and maintenance of the concepts related to improving the performance of students with disabilities.

In Indiana, the provision of LEA technical assistance and professional development go hand in hand. Dependent upon the subject matter and the intensity of the need, IDOE/OSE offers various levels of technical assistance and/or professional development. For ease of reading, the levels of assistance will be outlined as the 'Technical Assistance System', and the provision of technical assistance/professional development will be addressed in the "Professional Development System" description portion of the introduction.

IDOE/OSE provides technical assistance and professional development based upon three levels of need:

Universal

Targeted

Intensive

The universal level is available to all LEAs and includes resources through: discussion with or training by the IDOE/OSE staff members; the IDOE website including topic specific communities of learning; the IDOE Learning Connection; information about state and national resources (including the OSEP funded national technical assistance centers as well as the Indiana Resource Network [contracted vendors]); links and contact information to relevant local, regional and state resources; written guidance about specific topics; short video clips called 'Short Shares', webinars, and, question and answer documents.

The targeted level of assistance is available to those LEAs who have identified noncompliance found through the monitoring process described elsewhere in this introduction, or, if the LEA is in danger of being out of compliance if procedure/practice revisions are not made. The targeted level also includes those LEAs who have had personnel changes and require assistance to ensure new staff gain the knowledge of the expectations under IDEA. Assistance is provided via: webinars; conference calls; on-site or regional training opportunities that include evidence based practices; and, summits.

The intensive level of assistance has a focus on those LEAs that have identified issues that most likely are systemic and require rigorous LEA work and focused assistance by the IDOE/OSE and/or the Indiana Resource Network. Assistance will be individualized dependent upon the identified issue(s) and could include 1 to 1 consultation between LEA and IDOE/OSE and/or the Indiana Resource Network personnel (telephone, email, on site) and topic specific training provided to LEA staff by IDOE/OSE and/or contracted vendors.

As technical assistance and professional development occur in Indiana, the IDOE/OSE follows the principles of adult learning and includes evidence based practices. The effectiveness of the implementation is measured through the data collected for the specific indicators or evidence that practice has changed.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

For purposes of this introduction 'professional development' is defined as the provision of training and technical activities leading to the acquisition of skills and knowledge to improve the performance of students with disabilities. Depending upon the subject matter and the intensity of the need, IDOE/OSE offers various levels of technical assistance and/or professional development.

IDOE/OSE provides assistance to LEAs either directly (telephone/email and on-site) or indirectly (on-line resources, and/or through vendors that have been contracted for the purpose of technical assistance and/or professional development (Indiana Resource Network) (<http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/indiana-resource-network>).

These entities are described below and can be directly accessed by the LEAs in the state:

Indiana IEP Resource Center Focus: To increase Indiana educators' knowledge and skills that will (a) support the use of Indiana IEP to develop legally compliant IEPs that follow Article 7 requirements, (b) provide technical assistance and professional development for Indiana educators and staff who are involved in the development of high quality IEPs, (c) support Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) in the development and use of procedures to ensure compliance and the fidelity of implementation of IEP goals and services that will result in high quality instruction and programming evident by data review and progress monitoring and (d) provide tiered level of support for statewide efforts to improve outcomes related to Least Restrictive Environment (Indicator 5).

Indiana Center on Teacher Quality (ICTQ) In partnership with schools, families, agencies and communities, the Indiana Center on Teacher Quality (ICTQ) seeks to improve educational outcomes for students by ensuring their access to a pre-k through 12 continuum of instruction from high quality teachers. ICTQ intends to 1) increase the number of high quality teachers serving students with disabilities by providing job embedded professional development at the state, regional and district levels; 2) increase the number of students with disabilities who have access to a high quality teacher by improving recruitment, support and retention of all teachers who teach students with disabilities across the LRE continuum (general education and special education); and 3) to improve school transitions and post-school outcomes for students with disabilities through partnerships and collaborations among schools, community agencies, higher education and families in a pre-K-12 system of support by aligning the policies and practices of key educational stakeholders across the lifespan serving individuals with disabilities.

Project Success Focus: Support of teachers and administrators in the design and implementation of Indiana Academic Standards in curriculum and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities. This includes providing critical background information and access to instructional and resource materials developed by NCSC that have been tailored to Indiana's standards. Project SUCCESS provides monthly professional development sessions to participating teams and on-site technical assistance as needed.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

IN*SOURCE Focus: Since 1975, the Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs or IN*SOURCE has provided service to Indiana's families of infants, toddlers, children, youth and young adults with disabilities. IN*SOURCE is a parent organization. Through the work and dedication of the Board of Directors, the staff and many volunteers, virtually all of whom are parents of persons with disabilities, IN*SOURCE, utilizing a proven parent to parent model, has provided assistance, support services and educational resources to the community of individuals and organizations that serve and support persons with disabilities. Through the provision of information, training, individual assistance and support, they worked to help countless families confront the complexities and challenges of having a loved one with special needs. IN*SOURCE celebrates the accomplishments of individuals with disabilities and their families and affirms their ongoing commitment to them.

Pass Project: Promoting Achievement for Students with Sensory Loss Focus: To provide professional development opportunities for educators that will improve instructional quality, promote academic achievement and foster successful post-secondary transition outcomes for students with sensory loss.

Indiana Deafblind Services Project Focus: The Indiana Deafblind Services Project is designed to improve the quality of educational services available to Indiana's infants, toddlers, children and youth who have a combined vision and hearing loss.

PATINS Project Focus: The PATINS Project is a state-wide technical assistance network that provides accessible technology for assisting LEAs in the utilization and creation of accessible learning environments and instructional materials. The PATINS Project provides a complete state NIMAS delivery process, inclusive of assistive and accessible technologies, designed to support the Indiana Department of Education and LEAs in addressing the statutory and final regulatory requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004.

Indiana Center for Accessible Instructional Materials (ICAM) Focus: The Indiana Center for Accessible Instructional Materials (ICAM) is a PATINS Project managed web-based system designed to provide supports to Indiana LEAs in meeting the NIMAS regulations of the Individuals with Disabilities Improvement Act of 2004. The mission is to partner with LEAs in securing accessible textbooks and core curriculum materials in specialized formats for qualifying students with print disabilities. Access to the system, technical support and professional training are provided through the ICAM and PATINS projects without a fee.

Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center Focus: To create and enhance professional development activities and resources in order to build capacity that will improve school and post-school outcomes. The center's work focuses on student-focused planning activities and self-determination skill development; improved Transition IEPs and use of transition assessments; access to effective academic and life-skills instruction, quality work-based learning; interagency collaboration; and, family involvement.

There are other resources in the state that can be accessed by the LEA, however IDOE/OSE does not have a direct contract relationship. They include:

Resource Services at Blumberg Center Focus: To increase the use of knowledge, procedures, and practices that (a) ensure targeted and high quality instruction and intervention for all students, (b) promote accurate and appropriate identification and programming for students with disabilities, and (c) advance the use of assessment data for the purposes of instructional planning and programming. Multiple resource materials, web modules, and videos are available on the project's website. Training and technical assistance services are available to schools, districts, and special education cooperatives/planning districts on a contracted, fee-for-services basis.

HANDS (Helping Answer Needs by Developing Specialists) in Autism Resource Center Focus: To help school personnel increase knowledge, skill and application of research-based educational and behavioral strategies rooted in Applied Behavior Analysis and related to working with students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) and other neurodevelopmental disabilities. These interventions will foster collaboration, data-driven decision making, and alternatives for discipline that will lead to improved instruction and limited behavioral challenges in the classroom as well as other school and community settings. A wide range of resources, materials, trainings and consultations are available to assist consumers in learning about and practically applying best practice strategies across disciplines, roles and settings with students of all ages and functioning levels. Services and resources are available for a range of free, low cost and fee-for-service or contractual basis.

Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) Focus: The Center on Education and Lifelong Learning (CELL) provides tools, training and technical assistance as schools increase student achievement, build staff capacity and align resources. Their work focuses on professional development related to teacher evaluation systems, differentiated instruction, classroom management, co-teaching, instructional consultation teams (ICT), cultural responsive practices, and PBIS. In addition, CELL conducts program evaluations for a variety of district, state and national programs.

Center for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Education (CDHHE)

Focus: To promote positive outcomes for all deaf and hard of hearing children through information, services, and education. The CDHHE provides direct services and facilitation of services to children birth through school exit. The Indiana State Department of Health has executive oversight of the CDHHE. The CDHHE (The Center) works directly with school districts, professionals, parents/guardians and with State agencies, including the Department of Education, the Indiana School for the Deaf, the Family and Social Services Administration, and the Indiana State Department of Health. Services provided for school-age children include transition support from Part C to special education services, comprehensive multidisciplinary assessments, hearing assessments and technical assistance to schools, Teacher of Record services, secondary transition support, and school program consultation and assessments.

The Indiana Resource Center for Autism

Focus: The Indiana Resource Center for Autism (IRCA) staff are actively engaged in work that leads to improved outcomes for individuals on the autism spectrum and related disorders, and their families by providing professionals, family members, and individuals with ASD with the knowledge and skills to support children and adults in typical early intervention, school, community, work, postsecondary and home settings.

The work of IRCA covers a wide range of activities focused on building local capacity via information development and dissemination, customized trainings, statewide conferences, individual consultations, coaching, and research.

Through social media (Facebook, Twitter, Pinterest), numerous list serves, website and free newsletter, IRCA provides access to a wealth of free and practical tools that can be easily replicated and used across a variety of settings. As Indiana's state legislated autism center, IRCA is committed to responding with accurate and timely information that addresses the needs of individuals across the autism spectrum and across the lifespan.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: ☒ apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

In the course of the development of the State Performance Plan (SPP) input was obtained from parent groups, LEAs, other state agencies, and institutions of higher education. As targets for specific indicators were revised through FFY 2012 (SY 12-13) the Indiana Department of Education, Office of Special Education (OSE) obtained stakeholder input from the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC). Additionally, there is a specific stakeholder group that has been developed to address and include stakeholder input and engagement with regard to Indicator 17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan. The members of this stakeholder group are a diverse group of members from various internal and external departments, and organizations that are able to provide support to the development and implementation of the SSIP.

In preparation for the FFY 2013 through FFY 2018 SPP, the OSE prepared trend data information for each of the indicators and developed recommended targets based upon that data. The stakeholders reviewed the trend data, discussed the information and as the result of that discussion identified the targets for each of the indicators. The stakeholders represent various constituency groups, including individuals with disabilities, parents of children with disabilities as well as teachers, state and local education officials, program administrators, representatives of various state agencies, representatives of higher education institutions that prepare special education and related service personnel, representatives of nonpublic schools, and representatives of vocational, community, or business

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2014 APR in 2016, is available.

1) How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2014 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2014 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A)

The OSE sent a hard copy letter to each Local Education Agency (LEA) Superintendent as well as an electronic copy to the local Special Education Director. These letters include an attachment that reflects the performance of the LEA.

The letters are found at <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/monitoring>, under "Findings of Noncompliance", then "Status of Compliance Notifications FFY2014 (SY14-15)."

2) A description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2014 APR in 2015, is available.

The State Performance Plan is found at <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/monitoring>, under "Federal Reporting", then "Indiana Part B SPP FFY2005-2012 (Revised 02/2014).

See <http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/618-reporting> for federally reported 618 data.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

OSEP Response

On November 16, 2016 OSEP placed a special condition on Indiana's FFY 2016 IDEA Part B grant award. Specifically, OSEP placed a special condition on Indiana's FFY 2016 IDEA Part B grant award because Indiana failed to conduct, in the 2015-2016 school year, fully operational alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, as permitted under the regulations for Title I, part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), that are capable of measuring the achievement of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

Please refer to the Progress Page for OSEP's response to the State's prior Part B Indicator 15 finding.

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2012

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			74.00%	87.10%	75.00%	56.71%	59.95%	59.95%	95.00%	64.00%	67.00%
Data		69.46%	52.60%	53.20%	58.95%	58.95%	69.72%	65.31%	71.72%	69.29%	73.41%


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets


FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	6,529	
SY 2014-15 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/4/2016	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	9,212	null
SY 2014-15 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/4/2016	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	70.87%	Calculate 

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2014 Data	FFY 2015 Target	FFY 2015 Data
6,529	9,212	73.41%	70.00%	70.87%

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Per the measurement table Indiana is to provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma. And, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular diploma. If there is a difference, explain. In Indiana Youth with IEPs must meet the same requirements as youth without IEPs to graduate with a regular diploma. Please see the attached document for the Diploma requirements.

Or, visit <http://www.doe.in.gov/ccr/indianas-diploma-requirements> for the requirements.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE
Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≤			26.00%	25.00%	24.00%	23.00%	22.00%	21.00%	20.00%	9.01%	8.51%
Data		30.54%	32.63%	30.01%	26.99%	15.93%	10.76%	10.76%	8.54%	8.51%	6.94%


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	8.01%	7.51%	7.01%	6.51%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	5,820	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	936	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	71	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	564	null
SY 2014-15 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C009; Data Group 85)	6/7/2016	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	27	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out [d]	Total number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) [a + b + c + d + e]	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
564	7,418	6.94%	8.01%	7.60%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			92.50%	93.00%	93.50%	94.00%	94.50%	95.00%	77.50%	77.50%	78.00%
Data		81.90%		84.00%	86.80%	98.00%	99.25%	77.00%	77.59%	76.11%	

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	78.50%	79.00%	79.50%	80.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Does your State have an ESEA Flexibility Waiver of determining AYP?

☒ Yes ☐ No

Are you reporting AYP or AMO?

☒ AYP ☐ AMO

Number of districts in the State	Number of districts that met the minimum "n" size	Number of districts that meet the minimum "n" size AND met AMO	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
380	null	null		78.50%	

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥				95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		96.87%	96.20%	97.10%	96.80%	96.00%	97.00%	95.50%	96.10%	96.58%	96.73%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥				95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
			Data		96.87%	96.20%	97.40%	97.30%	96.00%	97.00%	95.60%	96.50%	96.94%	97.68%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	88,634	78,582	96.73%	95.00%	88.66%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

Slippage in the area of participation for FFY 15 for both Reading and Math can be attributed to the removal of students with the most significant disabilities from the total "n" for both participation and proficiency. IDOE had to remove these students due to the following assessment issues that have already been reported to USED.

Issue #1
Due to unclear instructions regarding the use of calculators on the State’s general mathematics assessments (Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+)), a small number of students’ scores on the assessment (0.8 percent) in grades 6-8 and 10 could not be validated.

Issue #2
Indiana’s technical advisory committee (TAC) concluded that there were not a sufficient number of items on the State’s new alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting (ISTAR), to set alternate academic achievement standards.

Data for the statewide performance of students in Indiana on the ISTEP can be located at the following link:
<http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/accountability/press2016istepstatedisagg-grades-03-08.xlsx>

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	88,634	78,837	97.68%	95.00%	88.95%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Slippage in the area of participation for FFY 15 for both Reading and Math can be attributed to the removal of students with the most significant disabilities from the total "n" for both participation and proficiency. IDOE had to remove these students due to the following assessment issues that have already been reported to USED.

Issue #1

Due to unclear instructions regarding the use of calculators on the State's general mathematics assessments (Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+)), a small number of students' scores on the assessment (0.8 percent) in grades 6-8 and 10 could not be validated.

Issue #2

Indiana's technical advisory committee (TAC) concluded that there were not a sufficient number of items on the State's new alternate assessment for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting (ISTAR), to set alternate academic achievement standards.

Data for the statewide performance of students in Indiana on the ISTEP can be located at the following link:

<http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/accountability/press2016istepstatedisagg-grades-03-08.xlsx>

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

The DOE has created a place on the Office of Special Education homepage for Public reporting

<http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed>

<http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/618-reporting> (updated effective 05/01/2017)

Information located in the Reading and Math Assessment Tabs of the workbook

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

On November 16, 2016 OSEP placed a special condition on Indiana's FFY 2016 IDEA Part B grant award. Specifically, OSEP placed a special condition on Indiana's FFY 2016 IDEA Part B grant award because Indiana failed to conduct, in the 2015-2016 school year, fully operational alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, as permitted under the regulations for Title I, part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), that are capable of measuring the achievement of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State report to the public on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments administered in the 2015-2016 school year with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the district and or school levels.

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because the State did not report the number of children with disabilities who participated in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards that were administered in the 2015-2016 school year, at State, district and school levels. In order to count as a participant, a valid score would need to be assigned. The State was unable to assign valid scores because it failed to conduct, in the 2015-2016 school year, fully operational alternate assessments that were aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, as required by 34 CFR 300.160(a) and (c). Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2017 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported to the public, for FFY 2015, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2016.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			34.00%	34.00%	35.00%	36.00%	37.00%	38.00%	39.00%	48.00%	54.00%
			Data		33.31%	33.60%	39.88%	54.02%	43.00%	50.00%	52.70%	52.80%	55.12%	32.33%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			39.00%	40.00%	41.00%	42.00%	43.00%	44.00%	45.00%	57.00%	61.00%
			Data		42.13%	42.50%	48.50%	64.11%	51.00%	57.00%	62.10%	60.20%	63.37%	35.41%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	60.00%	62.00%	64.00%	66.00%
Math	A ≥ Overall	65.00%	67.00%	69.00%	71.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	78,582	20,215	32.33%	60.00%	25.72%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

Per the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Indiana and the Indiana Department of Education's Office of Student Assessment:

The 2016 ISTEP+ test was the second year of a new state assessment for grades 3-8 based on Indiana's more rigorous college and career ready standards. As a result of the transition to new standards and assessment, a new baseline was established for ISTEP+ in 2015. As has been seen across the country, multiple years are required for educators and students to fully transition to more rigorous standards and assessments. 2016 was also the first year of a new state assessment for grade 10 on these more rigorous college and career ready standards. For this reason, grade 10 results are not comparable to previous years' pass rates. Instead, for the first time the high school results show the percentage of students meeting the new college and career ready benchmarks at each grade level. For the first time in more than 20 years, Indiana had a new state assessment vendor for the ISTEP+ assessment. This change had additional impact for students and educators during this implementation and transition year.

Additionally, IDOE experienced two issues with regard to the alternate assessment for students with the most significant disabilities. These issues led to the removal of all data reflecting both participation and performance for students with disabilities who took the alternate assessment, a total of 7,487 students.

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A Overall	78,837	20,257	35.41%	65.00%	25.69%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

Per the State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Indiana and the Indiana Department of Education's Office of Student Assessment:

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The 2016 ISTEP+ test was the second year of a new state assessment for grades 3-8 based on Indiana's more rigorous college and career ready standards. As a result of the transition to new standards and assessment, a new baseline was established for ISTEP+ in 2015. As has been seen across the country, multiple years are required for educators and students to fully transition to more rigorous standards and assessments. 2016 was also the first year of a new state assessment for grade 10 on these more rigorous college and career ready standards. For this reason, grade 10 results are not comparable to previous years' pass rates. Instead, for the first time the high school results show the percentage of students meeting the new college and career ready benchmarks at each grade level. For the first time in more than 20 years, Indiana had a new state assessment vendor for the ISTEP+ assessment. This change had additional impact for students and educators during this implementation and transition year.

Additionally, IDOE experienced two issues with regard to the alternate assessment for students with the most significant disabilities. These issues led to the removal of all data reflecting both participation and performance for students with disabilities who took the alternate assessment, a total of 7,487 students.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

<http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed/618-reporting> (updated effective 05/01/2017)

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

On November 16, 2016 OSEP placed a special condition on Indiana's FFY 2016 IDEA Part B grant award. Specifically, OSEP placed a special condition on Indiana's FFY 2016 IDEA Part B grant award because Indiana failed to conduct, in the 2015-2016 school year, fully operational alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards, as permitted under the regulations for Title I, part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), that are capable of measuring the achievement of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

The State did not reported to the public on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities on regular assessments at the district and school levels.

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for this indicator. These data are not valid and reliable because did not report compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, the performance results of children with disabilities at State, district and school levels. In order to count as a participant, a valid score would need to be assigned. The State was unable to assign valid scores because it failed to conduct, in the 2015-2016 school year, fully operational alternate assessments aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2017 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported to the public, for FFY 2015, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2016.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE
Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.
(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

Table with 12 columns: FFY, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014. Rows include Target ≤ and Data.

Key: [Gray box] Gray – Data Prior to Baseline [Yellow box] Yellow – Baseline [Blue box] Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

Table with 5 columns: FFY, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018. Row includes Target ≤.

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the introduction.

[Gray box] Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Table with 5 columns: Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, Number of districts in the State, FFY 2014 Data*, FFY 2015 Target*, FFY 2015 Data.

- Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):
Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Indiana Department of Education defines Indicator 4A significant discrepancy of students with disabilities in the rates of suspensions and expulsions greater than 10 days as an incidence rate that is two times higher than the State rate for two consecutive years. Indiana has a required minimum "n" size of 15 students with a disability in any of the racial/ethnic groups (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, White, Multiracial) suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year as well as a minimum of 15 in the comparison group.
Indiana notified the LEAs that the annual data analysis reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold) with this indicator and required each LEA to participate in a policy, procedure and practice file review. This review was consistent with the requirements under 34 CFR §300.170(b) relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.If the LEA exceeded the threshold, then the LEA policies and procedures are reviewed and a minimum of 5 files (to determine practice) reviewed on students who were evaluated and identified as students with disabilities. If policies, procedures and/or practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings were issued.
Indicator 4A
Compliant LEAs 28
Non-compliant LEAs 0
LEAs that did not meet n size 324
LEAs that did not have 2 years of data 26

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

LEAs with continued noncompliance

2

Total

380

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

Indiana notified the LEAs that the annual data analysis reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold) with this indicator and required each LEA to participate in a policy, procedure and practice file review. If the LEA exceeded the threshold, then the LEA policies and procedures are reviewed and a minimum of 5 files (to determine practice) reviewed on students who were evaluated and identified as students with disabilities. If policies, procedures and/or practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings were issued.

☐ The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

☒ The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

☒ The State DID ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEAs worked with IDOE and Indiana Resource Network staff regularly to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. Through these phone calls, emails, and on-site technical assistance, IDOE verified correction of all individual cases of noncompliance. The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

☐ The State did NOT ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	6	0	1

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review, and a root cause analysis questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP.

In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they were required to work with IDOE staff and/or the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and IDOE specialist to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The IDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via phone calls and e-mails with the LEA until noncompliance was corrected. Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and Indiana Department of Education consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they could work with the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). IDOE verified the correction of all noncompliance. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures and practices (Prong 2) and confirmation of correction of each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified previously (Prong 1). The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEAs worked with IDOE and Indiana Resource Network staff regularly to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. Through these phone calls, emails, and on-site technical assistance, IDOE verified correction of all individual cases of noncompliance. The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One LEA did not correct within a year. This LEAs received more intensive technical assistance and the Part B grant has been placed on special conditions. In addition to working with an IDOE specialist, this LEA worked with one of our Indiana Resource Network resource centers. Please see introduction (Improvement/Correction/ Incentives/Sanctions) for information on this LEA that did not correct.

Explanation of Alternate Data

Two LEAs did not correct within a year. These LEAs received more intensive technical assistance. In addition to working with an IDOE specialist, the LEAs worked with one of our Indiana Resource Network resource centers in order to correct outstanding noncompliance. One LEA did correct both prongs of their finding and was released. One did not. Please see introduction (Improvement/Correction/ Incentives/Sanctions) for information on this LEA that did not correct.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Please see introduction (Improvement/Correction/ Incentives/Sanctions) for information on this LEA that did not correct.

OSEP Response

The State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, on the correction of noncompliance that the State identified in FFY 2015 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b). When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must report that it has verified that each district with noncompliance identified by the State: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and FFY 2013 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was partially corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and FFY 2013: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						1.50%	2.31%	2.00%	1.70%	2.50%	0.27%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- ☒ Number of districts in the State
☐ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
2	2	380	0.27%	0%	0.53%

Explanation of Slippage

Indiana Department of Education did not meet its current target of 0% for the reporting year and had slippage. In the reporting year, when a LEA's data exceeded the risk ratio, Indiana Department of Education instituted a more rigorous review of policies, procedures, and practices than in previous years. The update Policy and Procedure Survey as well as File Review Rubrics required LEAs to provide more explanation and documentation as compared to previous year. Due to the higher expectations, slippage occurred.

☒ All races and ethnicities were included in the review

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Indiana's definition identifies Significant Discrepancy of racial and ethnic groups (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, Black or African American, White, and Multiracial) as a risk ratio for a given racial/ethnic group that is greater than 2.0 for two consecutive years. Indiana has a required minimum "n" size of 15 students with a disability in any of the racial/ethnic groups suspended or expelled for more than 10 days in a school year as well as a minimum of 15 in the comparison group.

Indiana notified the LEAs that the annual data analysis reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold) with this indicator and required each LEA to participate in a policy, procedure and practice file review. This review was consistent with the requirements under 34 CFR §300.170(b) relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.If the LEA exceeded the threshold, then the LEA policies and procedures are reviewed and a minimum of 5 files (to determine practice) reviewed on students who were evaluated and identified as students with disabilities. If policies, procedures and/or practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings were issued.

Indicator 4B

Compliant LEAs	18
Non-compliant LEAs	1
LEAs that did not meet n size	334
LEAs that did not have 2 years of data	26
LEAs with continued noncompliance	1
Total	380

Actions required in FFY 2014 response


none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2014 Identification of Noncompliance**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices** (completed in FFY 2015 using 2014-2015 data)

Description of review

Indiana notified the LEAs that the data analysis reflected possible noncompliance with this indicator and required each LEA to participate in policy, procedure and practice file review. Indiana selected 5 files that were evaluated and identified as students with disabilities. If policies, procedures and practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings were issued.

 The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

 The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on a Root Cause analysis (RCA) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review, and a root cause analysis questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP.

In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they were required to work with IDOE staff and/or the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and IDOE specialist to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The IDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via phone calls and e-mails with the LEA until noncompliance was corrected. Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and Indiana Department of Education consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they could work with the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). IDOE verified the correction of all noncompliance. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures and practices (Prong 2) and confirmation of correction of each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified previously (Prong 1). The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	0	0	1

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected*Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected*

One LEA did not correct within a year. This LEA received more intensive technical assistance. In addition to working with an IDOE specialist, this LEA worked with one of our Indiana Resource Network resource centers. Please see introduction (Improvement/Correction/ Incentives/Sanctions) for information on this LEA that did not correct.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator) for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that the districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2015 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 as a result of the review it conducted pursuant to 34 CFR §300.170(b) was not corrected. When reporting on the correction of this noncompliance, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each district with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

In the data table titled "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2014", the five findings originally shown from FFY 2013 now show as zero findings in the "Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2014 APR" column. As a result, OSEP cannot determine whether the State verified the five findings from FFY 2013. Therefore, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that the remaining five uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2008	Target ≥			60.37%	60.38%	60.39%	60.40%	60.41%	60.42%	60.43%	67.00%	68.00%
		Data		59.54%	63.19%	62.81%	63.77%	64.89%	67.86%	69.28%	68.81%	70.01%	70.55%
B	2008	Target ≤			15.30%	15.29%	15.28%	15.27%	15.26%	15.25%	15.24%	12.00%	11.50%
		Data		14.33%	13.14%	13.06%	12.94%	12.51%	12.60%	12.03%	10.90%	10.65%	10.55%
C	2008	Target ≤			1.22%	1.21%	1.20%	1.19%	1.18%	1.17%	1.16%	2.16%	2.15%
		Data		1.99%	2.20%	2.50%	2.42%	2.46%	2.25%	2.26%	2.19%	2.08%	2.06%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	69.00%	70.00%	71.00%	72.00%
Target B ≤	11.00%	10.50%	10.00%	9.50%
Target C ≤	2.14%	2.13%	2.12%	2.11%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	153,319	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	109,473	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15,971	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	1,419	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	704	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/14/2016	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	981	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	109,473	153,319	70.55%	69.00%	71.40%

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	15,971	153,319	10.55%	11.00%	10.42%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	3,104	153,319	2.06%	2.14%	2.02%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									38.71%	39.50%	40.00%
		Data								38.70%	40.34%	40.69%	40.12%
B	2011	Target ≤									35.19%	33.10%	33.00%
		Data								35.20%	33.32%	33.13%	33.81%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	40.50%	41.00%	41.50%	42.00%
Target B ≤	32.90%	32.80%	32.70%	32.60%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	18,049	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,053	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	5,704	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b2. Number of children attending separate school	447	null
SY 2015-16 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/14/2016	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	7,053	18,049	40.12%	40.50%	39.08%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	6,153	18,049	33.81%	32.90%	34.09%

Explanation of A Slippage

There was slippage of 1.04% from FFY 2014 to FFY 2015 for the percentage of students attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of services in that program. It should also be noted that the percentage of students in a separate program increased. This increase affected the percentages. After analyzing the data of the two years, it was determined that the number of children eligible for services under the category of autism had increased. Looking at the placement of these students, it was apparent that the individual case conference committees made the decision based on individual students' needs, that more students were placed in separate classrooms, schools, and facilities, thus affecting the percentage receiving services within the regular education program.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2010	Target ≥						52.50%	53.00%	53.50%	54.00%	72.00%	73.00%
		Data					52.00%	66.10%	64.20%	78.30%	73.70%	72.27%	69.83%
A2	2010	Target ≥						41.00%	41.50%	42.00%	42.50%	22.00%	23.00%
		Data					40.70%	36.10%	20.40%	20.10%	25.80%	19.83%	18.21%
B1	2010	Target ≥						65.50%	66.00%	66.50%	67.00%	80.50%	81.00%
		Data					65.10%	65.00%	72.60%	77.70%	81.30%	78.10%	77.55%
B2	2010	Target ≥						48.00%	48.50%	49.00%	49.50%	15.00%	15.50%
		Data					47.80%	32.40%	15.40%	13.30%	16.00%	10.27%	9.83%
C1	2010	Target ≥						77.00%	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	83.00%	83.50%
		Data					76.70%	63.10%	74.50%	80.00%	83.20%	81.22%	80.28%
C2	2010	Target ≥						64.50%	65.00%	65.50%	66.00%	16.50%	17.00%
		Data					64.40%	31.50%	16.90%	13.90%	17.40%	11.45%	11.26%


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%
Target A2 ≥	24.00%	25.00%	26.00%	27.00%
Target B1 ≥	81.50%	82.00%	82.50%	83.00%
Target B2 ≥	16.00%	16.50%	17.00%	17.50%
Target C1 ≥	84.00%	84.50%	85.00%	85.50%
Target C2 ≥	17.50%	18.00%	18.50%	19.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	2947.00
--	---------

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	35.00	1.19%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	722.00	24.50%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1598.00	54.22%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	449.00	15.24%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	143.00	4.85%

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2047.00	2804.00	69.83%	74.00%	73.00%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	592.00	2947.00	18.21%	24.00%	20.09%

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	13.00	0.44%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	573.00	19.44%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2046.00	69.43%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	265.00	8.99%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	50.00	1.70%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2311.00	2897.00	77.55%	81.50%	79.77%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	315.00	2947.00	9.83%	16.00%	10.69%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	14.00	0.48%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	488.00	16.56%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	2086.00	70.78%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	296.00	10.04%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	63.00	2.14%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	2382.00	2884.00	80.28%	84.00%	82.59%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	359.00	2947.00	11.26%	17.50%	12.18%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" and list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

The Indiana Department of Education utilizes the ISTAR-KR assessment tool which is a derivative of the Foundations to the Indiana Academic Standards and is aligned to the Indiana Standards for Kindergarten in the areas of mathematics, English/language arts and three functional areas, including: physical skills, personal care skills and social-emotional skills. Teachers/SLP's complete the online questionnaire at the entrance, annually, and exit of the program. The initial entrance and final exit scores are used to assess growth. Student outcome and KR Cut scores were developed per age range. Based on the student data, a score that is equal to or above the expected score would be considered evidence of achievement at a level that is "comparable to same age peers".

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			88.20%	88.40%	88.60%	42.20%	42.40%	42.60%	42.80%	69.00%	70.00%
Data			93.60%	80.40%	90.10%	42.20%	69.60%	70.70%	71.10%	92.69%	88.59%


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	71.00%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
18731.67	19502.00	88.59%	71.00%	96.05%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

Indiana implemented a new survey format to complete the parent survey in January, 2015. This is the first full APR reporting year to be entirely covered by the survey. All parents of students age 3-21 that receive special education services had the option to complete the survey after the annual case conference on a computer provided by the school, take home a parent letter and complete the parent survey at home, or contact the Indiana Department of Education for a paper copy. Over 19,000 surveys were completed following case conferences (representing approximately 11% of all initial or annual case conferences held). Survey response rate continues to increase. The figure cited above for parents reporting schools facilitating parent involvement is an average of a 19 question battery involving different aspects of schools facilitating parent involvement through the CCC and implementation processes.

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

In order to obtain an acceptable response rate and a representative sample of respondents, the IDOE enlisted support from the Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs (IN*SOURCE), and any other identified advocacy organizations that were willing to support the Indicator 8 Parent Survey completion. To further support an improved response rate, the IDOE provided multiple response mechanisms for respondents. Parents were able to respond to a web-based survey or via a paper survey. The survey was offered to respondents in English and in Spanish and they were provided with contact information at IDOE for any follow-up questions or additional support in completing the survey.

To eliminate or reduce bias, schools are instructed to ensure parent privacy while taking the survey on a school-provided computer. School personnel are also instructed not to administer the survey to parents under any circumstances. When adaptations are needed, parents are asked to contact IDOE.

Statistical tests of representativeness are strongly indicative that the response rate was representative of the overall population of students with disabilities. Deviations from expected values of survey response distribution by disability categories were well within tolerable differences for representativeness. The percentages of survey respondent distribution by student disability category and the overall disability category distribution for students 10/31/2017

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

across the state are as follows:

Autism Spectrum Disorder	12.1%	8.9%
Blind/Low Vision	0.7%	0.6%
Cognitive Disability	7.7%	8.5%
Deaf/Blind	0.1%	0.0%
Deaf/Hard of Hearing	1.4%	1.4%
Developmental Delay	5.3%	2.5%
Emotional Disability	6.5%	7.4%
Language/Speech Impairment	20.4%	23.9%
Multiple Disabilities	2.5%	1.3%
Orthopedic Impairment	1.0%	0.9%
Other Health Impairment	13.2%	12.4%
Specific Learning Disability	28.7%	31.8%
Traumatic Brain Injury	0.3%	0.3%

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? Yes

Is it a new or revised collection tool? No

☒ Yes, the data accurately represent the demographics of the State

☐ No, the data does not accurately represent the demographics of the State

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		3.41%	0%	0.30%	0.29%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- ☒ Number of districts in the State
- ☐ Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
0	0	380	0%	0%	0%

☒ All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Indiana defines disproportionate representation as disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, White, Multiracial) in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification. Indiana defines disproportionate representation as a risk ratio greater than 2.0 in special education and related services for two consecutive years. Indiana has a required minimum “n” size of 15 students with a disability in a given population as well as a minimum of 15 in the comparison group

Indiana notified the LEAs that the data analysis reflected possible noncompliance with this indicator and required each LEA to participate in policy, procedure and practice file review. Indiana selected 5 files that were evaluated and identified as students with disabilities. If policies, procedures and practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings were issued.

Indicator 9

Compliant LEAs	354
Non-compliant LEAs	0
LEAs that did not meet n size	10
LEAs that did not have 2 years of data	16
LEAs with continued noncompliance	0
Total	380

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		3.41%	4.15%	3.85%	4.05%	0%	3.18%	3.18%	1.13%	1.94%	2.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- Number of districts in the State
- Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
345	7	380	2.70%	0%	1.84%

☒ All races and ethnicities were included in the review

Describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification

Indiana notified the LEAs that the annual data analysis reflected possible noncompliance (over the Indiana defined risk ratio threshold) with this indicator and required each LEA to participate in a policy, procedure and practice file review. If the LEA exceeded the threshold, then the LEA policies and procedures are reviewed and a minimum of 5 files (to determine practice) reviewed on students who were evaluated and identified as students with disabilities. If policies, procedures and/or practices were determined to be inappropriate, findings were issued.

Define “disproportionate representation” and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Indiana’s definition of disproportionate representation is the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups (American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Hispanic or Latino, Black or African American, White, Multiracial) in specific disability categories (Cognitive Disability, Specific Learning Disability, Emotional Disability, Language or Speech Impairment, Other Health Impairment, and Autism Spectrum Disorder) that is the result of inappropriate identification. Indiana has a required minimum “n” size of 15 students with a disability in a given population as well as a minimum of 15 in the comparison group. Indiana calculates risk ratios for all of LEAs in the state. School districts must exceed the data threshold (2.0 risk ratio) for 2 consecutive years.

Indicator 10

Compliant LEAs	338
Non compliant LEAs	6
LEAs that did not meet n size	19
LEAs that did not have 2 years of data	16
LEAs with continued noncompliance	1
Total	380

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
11	10	0	1

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review, and a root cause analysis questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP.

In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they were required to work with IDOE staff and/or the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and IDOE specialist to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The IDOE maintained communication and technical assistance via phone calls and e-mails with the LEA until noncompliance was corrected. Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and Indiana Department of Education consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they could work with the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). IDOE verified the correction of all noncompliance. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures and practices (Prong 2) and confirmation of correction of each individual case of noncompliance that had been identified previously (Prong 1). The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEAs worked with IDOE and Indiana Resource Network staff regularly to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. Through these phone calls, emails, and on-site technical assistance, IDOE verified correction of all individual cases of noncompliance. The IDOE also collected and verified the data by obtaining a new randomized sample to ensure that the individual and systemic noncompliance had been resolved.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

One LEA did not correct within a year. This LEAs received more intensive technical assistance and the Part B grant has been placed on special conditions. In addition to working with an IDOE specialist, this LEA worked with one of our Indiana Resource Network resource centers. Please see introduction (Improvement/Correction/ Incentives/Sanctions) for information on this LEA that did not correct.

Explanation of Alternate Data

Two LEAs did not correct within a year. These LEAs received more intensive technical assistance. In addition to working with an IDOE specialist, the LEAs worked with one of our Indiana Resource Network resource centers in order to correct outstanding noncompliance. One LEA did correct both prongs of their finding and was released. One did not. Please see introduction (Improvement/Correction/ Incentives/Sanctions) for information on this LEA that did not correct.

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

Please see introduction (Improvement/Correction/ Incentives/Sanctions) for information on this LEA that did not correct.

OSEP Response

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that the one district identified in FFY 2014 and the one district identified in FFY 2013 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 and FFY 2013: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015 (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that the seven districts identified in FFY 2015 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201, and 300.301 through 300.311, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find



Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		78.00%	85.90%	87.70%	92.30%	98.00%	98.50%	97.90%	97.85%	98.84%	99.26%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
9,360	9,239	99.26%	100%	98.71%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	121
---	-----

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

The total number of students that were evaluated outside of the timelines for Indiana are 146 students. Timelines were missed for a variety of reasons identified as follows: staff shortages, volume of referrals, scheduling conflicts, timeline errors, inadequate tracking, improper documentation and staff errors. The range and number of days missed for each evaluation is identified in the table below.

1-5 days: 60
6-10 day: 19
11 -15 days: 9
16-20 days: 9
21-25 days: 6
26+ days: 26

Staff Shortages	Volume of Referrals	Scheduling Conflicts	Timeline Errors	Inadequate Tracking	Improper Documentation	Staff Errors
-----------------	---------------------	----------------------	-----------------	---------------------	------------------------	--------------

36	28	18	3	31	7	46
----	----	----	---	----	---	----

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- ☒ The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- ☐ The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☐ State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The data for this indicator was submitted to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) via a secure site known as the Student Test Number (STN) Application Center. Each Local Educational Agency (LEA) must upload child count as well as performance and compliance data to the STN Application Center. This data is then stored in the IDOE data warehouse where it can be extracted and used for state and federal funding, performance indicators, and compliance indicators. Target data was gathered from the IDOE-EV report and then verified with LEAs to ensure accuracy. Data used in the APR is derived from the final verification reports submitted by LEAs.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
24	23	0	1

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to review and revise their policies, procedures, and practices relating to the process of conducting the initial evaluation within timeline parameters. Each LEA created a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on a Root Cause Analysis (RCA) through the submission of a Monitoring Workbook. The Monitoring Workbook included LEA specific data in regard to the file review, and a root cause analysis questionnaire to be completed by the staff of the LEA in order to inform the CAP.

In addition, the LEAs identified with noncompliance were informed that they were required to work with IDOE staff and/or the appropriate Indiana Resource Network (IRN) technical assistance provider(s). Progress on this Indicator was monitored through the regularly scheduled contacts between the LEA and Indiana Department of Education consultant to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEAs work with IDOE staff through the regularly scheduled contacts to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The LEAs that were issued findings were assigned an IDOE consultant and required to develop a corrective action plan (CAP) in order to identify the root cause(s) of noncompliance and to change and update policies, procedures and practices in order to correctly implement all regulatory requirements of the Indicator. The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from LEAs and verified that the appropriate changes were made. Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the IDOE verified that unless the child no longer remained under the jurisdiction of the initiating LEA, all outstanding noncompliant initial evaluations were completed, although late. The IDOE verified completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting and reviewing updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system and verified the LEA achieved the 100% percent compliance requirement.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

LEAs identified as not meeting the required timeline for completing timeline compliance were required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in coordination with an education specialist at the IDOE. For those LEAs that had identified noncompliance in FFY 2014 (SY 14-15), the previously developed CAP was evaluated for effectiveness and updated to reflect more comprehensive activities. The LEAs that were not able to verify correction of policies and procedures will continue to receive consultation from an assigned IDOE consultant and participate in required corrective action as identified above.

Explanation of Alternate Data

Non Applicable

FFY 2013 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

LEAs identified as not meeting the required timeline for completing timeline compliance were required to develop a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in coordination with an education specialist at the IDOE during FFY2014. For those LEAs that had identified noncompliance in FFY 2013 (SY 13-14) or earlier, the previously developed CAP was evaluated for effectiveness and updated to reflect more comprehensive activities. The LEAs that were not able to verify correction of policies and procedures will continue to receive consultation from an assigned IDOE consultant and participate in required corrective action as identified above. Additional monitoring and data submissions are required as a part of the Corrective Action Plan.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that the one remaining uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, 10/31/2017

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

In the data table titled "Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2014", the two findings originally shown from FFY 2013 now show as one finding and the three findings originally shown from FFY 2012 now show as zero findings in the "Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2014 APR" column. As a result, OSEP cannot determine whether the State verified the two findings from FFY 2013 or the three findings from FFY 2012 as corrected. Therefore, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that the three uncorrected findings of noncompliance from FFY 2012 and the two uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2013 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2013: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition



Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		95.80%	93.40%	91.70%	92.74%	97.80%	93.96%	98.93%	99.04%	98.56%	99.25%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%



FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	1,077
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	129
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	793
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	93
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	62

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. $[c/(a-b-d-e)] \times 100$	793	793	99.25%	100%	100%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	0
--	---

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

-  State monitoring
-  State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

In FFY 2015 the data for this indicator was submitted to the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) via a secure site known as the Student Test Number (STN) Application Center. Each Local Educational Agency (LEA) must upload Child count as well as performance and compliance data to the STN Application Center. This data is then stored in the IDOE data warehouse where it can be extracted and used for state and federal funding, performance indicators, and compliance indicators.

Indicator 12 data was collected through the DOE-EV (Evaluation) report on July 1, 2016, and ranged from July 1, 2015 to June 30, 2016 in order to encompass the entire reporting year.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
7	7	0	0

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEAs work with IDOE staff through the regularly scheduled contacts to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The LEAs that were issued findings for FFY2014 and subsequent years were assigned an IDOE consultant and required to develop a corrective action plan (CAP) in order to identify the root cause(s) of noncompliance and to change and update policies, procedures and practices in order to correctly implement all regulatory requirements of the Indicator. The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from LEAs and verified that the appropriate changes were made. Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the IDOE verified that unless the child no longer remained under the jurisdiction of the initiating LEA, although late, each child that was eligible had an IEP developed and services were implemented. The IDOE verified completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting and reviewing updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The LEAs with findings of noncompliance were informed that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible but in no case greater than one year from the date of the issuance of the finding. The LEAs were informed that they were required to correct each individual case of noncompliance identified in the file review, unless the student was no longer under the jurisdiction of the LEA. The LEAs work with IDOE staff through the regularly scheduled contacts to address the specific reason(s) of noncompliance. The LEAs that were issued findings for FFY2014 and subsequent years were assigned an IDOE consultant and required to develop a corrective action plan (CAP) in order to identify the root cause(s) of noncompliance and to change and update policies, procedures and practices in order to correctly implement all regulatory requirements of the Indicator. The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from LEAs and verified that the appropriate changes were made. Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the IDOE verified that unless the child no longer remained under the jurisdiction of the initiating LEA, although late, each child that was eligible had an IEP developed and services were implemented. The IDOE verified completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting and reviewing updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system.

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from LEAs and verified that the appropriate changes were made. Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the IDOE verified that unless the child no longer remained under the jurisdiction of the initiating LEA, although late, each child that was eligible had an IEP developed and services were implemented. The IDOE verified completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting and reviewing updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The IDOE consultant collected the updated policies, procedures, and practices from LEAs and verified that the appropriate changes were made. Pursuant to OSEP Memorandum 09-02, the IDOE verified that unless the child no longer remained under the jurisdiction of the initiating LEA, although late, each child that was eligible had an IEP developed and services were implemented. The IDOE verified completion of the outstanding noncompliant timelines by collecting and reviewing updated evaluation information from LEAs on each individual case through the State's data system.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition



Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						80.22%	84.05%	73.32%	79.00%	81.05%	80.16%

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
418	484	80.16%	100%	86.36%

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- ☒ State monitoring
- ☐ State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

For Indicator 13 Indiana state rule requires transition plans begin at age 14, prior to the 9th grade, or earlier if determined appropriate by the case conference committee. The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) Office of Special Education contracted with the Center on Community Living and Careers (CCLC) at Indiana University to conduct a compliance review of a randomly selected sample of students' transition IEPs. The review was conducted to ensure that IDOE meets the reporting requirements and is providing ongoing assistance for school corporations with compliance rates less than 100%.

To determine and ensure compliance to Indicator 13, the IDOE has developed the Indiana Transition Requirements Checklist based on a data collection tool created by the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) and approved by the Office of Special Education Programs of the US Department of Education (OSEP). The Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center at the CCLC, Indiana Institute on Disability and Community at Indiana University has created an on-line version of Indiana's data collection tool that was used to analyze Indiana's student records to determine compliance with Indicator 13. The ten-item Indiana Transition Requirements Checklist was utilized to assess if there was evidence in a student's IEP that the student had been provided the appropriate transition services to prepare him/her to successfully transition from secondary school to a post-secondary education and/or training program and to employment at an accuracy rate of 100%.

IDOE provided CCLC with a population database of students who were receiving special education services and met the Indiana transition IEP age criteria for the monitored school year and whose local school districts are part of the monitoring cycle. The database included the Student Test Number (STN), which is the State of Indiana's student identification number and the Corporation Code Number. To generate the sample, CCLC used Microsoft Excel software to run a random sampling program. If the corporation had less than 100 students with disabilities, three students were selected for the review. For corporations with more than 500 students, 10 students were selected. Therefore, a minimum of 3 and maximum of 10 Transition IEPs were reviewed based on size of the district. In some cases, charter schools had sample sizes of less than three students because these schools were serving limited number of students or did not have large populations of students with disabilities. A report of the review is then provided to IDOE.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2014

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
44	37	0	7

FFY 2014 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) issued 44 Indicator 13 findings that were identified through an assessment by CCLC using the Indiana Transition IEP Requirements Checklist. 37 of those LEAs demonstrated correction by achieving 100% compliance on current IEPs using the Indiana Transition IEP Requirements Checklist. IDOE verified the correction of all non-compliance in 37 LEAs. This verification included a review of updated policies, procedures, and practices (Prong 2) and confirming correction of each individual non-compliant transition IEP that had been identified previously (Prong 1). The IDOE collected and verified the data by obtaining a new, randomized sample of youth with IEPs aged 14 and above, using Indiana's Transition Requirements Checklist to ensure that the individual and systemic non-compliance had been resolved. The IDOE maintained monthly communication via e-mails and phone calls providing resources and technical assistance to the LEA until non-compliance was corrected. Depending upon the corrective action plan generated by the LEA, IDOE provided one-on-one training and technical assistance at the LEA location or through regional trainings. LEA administrative and teaching personnel attended those opportunities.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

The IDOE verified correction to all individual cases of non-compliance by using Indiana's Transition Requirements Checklist to insure that each individual case had been corrected based on the IEP review in the Indiana IEP system. The IDOE also verified the enrollment status of a student of a non-compliant IEP is an LEA advised that the student was no longer enrolled due to graduation, transfer, withdrawal, etc. Correction was not required if the student was no longer enrolled in the LEA.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The IDOE continues to provide technical assistance to those LEAs who have failed to correct non-compliance within the first year. This assistance includes monthly communications via phone and email with special education directors and staff, on-site training with teachers who create Transition IEPs, and bi-monthly Transition IEP reviews to verify correction to previously reviewed non-compliant IEPs and to verify systemic correction to newly created IEPs. Resources specific to need are provided to the LEAs based on the IEP reviews.

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2015, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that the remaining seven uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2016 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015, although its FFY 2015 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2015.

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							34.80%	35.30%	35.80%	36.30%	36.80%
		Data						34.30%	32.50%	33.90%	35.90%	33.21%	35.68%
B	2009	Target ≥							49.10%	49.60%	51.10%	63.50%	64.00%
		Data						49.10%	56.40%	62.10%	63.80%	60.26%	62.81%
C	2009	Target ≥							86.60%	87.10%	87.60%	77.50%	78.00%
		Data						86.10%	76.10%	77.90%	78.00%	79.49%	83.92%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	37.30%	37.80%	38.30%	38.80%
Target B ≥	64.50%	65.00%	65.50%	66.00%
Target C ≥	78.50%	79.00%	79.50%	86.20%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	70.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	21.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	25.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	12.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	3.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	21.00	70.00	35.68%	37.30%	30.00%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	46.00	70.00	62.81%	64.50%	65.71%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	61.00	70.00	83.92%	78.50%	87.14%

Explanation of A Slippage

Indiana saw a slippage in the area of students enrolled in higher education, but saw increases in the areas of in the combined areas of training programs, competitive employment, and other forms of employment. We attribute the decrease of students attending higher education primarily as a result of this change to other forms of postsecondary activity. This is consistent with national and state trends regarding higher education enrollment, and 4-year colleges and universities in particular (especially for-profit institutions), possibly driven by higher education costs and stagnant incomes (see discussion on p. 13 of the attached report). Further trend data will be examined to determine the implications of these changes for state programming.

10/31/2017

Page 44 of 60

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Was sampling used? Yes

Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed? No

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

These results come from a random sample of 454 students who exited special education during the 2014-15 school year. In conjunction with our partners at Systems Improvement Group, the Indiana Department of Education has determined that a sampling methodology is superior to a full census model to obtain representativeness and minimize bias. Statistical testing (chi-squared goodness-of-fit tests at the 95 percent level of confidence) shows that the respondents are representative of the overall distribution of exiters with different disability types. A representative sample is the primary concern for validity for this data. Standardized protocols were followed by interviewers to support reliability (methodology discused in detail on pgs. 8-11 in the attached report).

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥				30.60%	30.80%	31.00%	31.20%	31.40%	31.60%	72.50%	73.00%
Data		30.20%	94.00%	66.00%	71.00%	66.00%	83.33%	83.02%	73.33%	80.43%	82.61%


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	73.50%	74.00%	74.50%	75.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	27	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/2/2016	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	53	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
27	53	82.61%	73.50%	50.94%

Explanation of Slippage

As the data reflects, 27 of the 53 resolution sessions were resolved the day the resolution session was held. Since the SEA is not involved in the resolution sessions it is difficult to say why there was slippage other than to use anecdotal information. For example, there are some attorneys and advocates that advise parents never to settle in a resolution session, rather, they are encouraged to find out what the school's 'bottom line is', then bring back the offer to the attorney or advocate. Upon this discussion the parent may decide to resolve the issue. Also, there may be back and forth follow-up questions between the parent and school after the session, which ultimately resolve the issue. In total, 86% of the total hearing requests resulted in a settlement.

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B)))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			52.40%	52.60%	52.80%	53.00%	53.00%	53.40%	53.64%	74.50%	75.00%
Data		52.00%	82.00%	55.00%	69.20%	69.40%	59.38%	76.47%	76.19%	79.25%	100%


Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline  Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	75.50%	76.00%	76.50%	77.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	n	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	50	null
SY 2015-16 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/2/2016	2.1 Mediations held	60	null

FFY 2015 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2014 Data*	FFY 2015 Target*	FFY 2015 Data
3	50	60	100%	75.50%	88.33%

Actions required in FFY 2014 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan



Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2014

FFY	2013	2014	2015
Target ≥		45.16%	45.66%
Data	29.00%	45.16%	

Key:  Gray – Data Prior to Baseline  Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	46.16%	46.66%	52.84%

Key:

Description of Measure

Indiana has submitted the SSIP report via four attachments to GRADS 360:


SSIP PHASE III-Year 1-April 2017 Annual Report-FINAL.pdf

IN-SSIP Comprehensive Manual - Verson 1.3-Submission for April 2017 Report

IN SSIP EVAL APRIL 2017 REPORT.pdf

SSIPNewsletterVol.1Issue112-01-2016.pdf

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input - Please see the Stakeholder Involvement section of the [introduction](#).

 Enter additional information about stakeholder involvement

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

April 1, 2015- Phase I Submission:

IDOE began the process of data analysis by collecting a comprehensive report of available assessment data from FFY 2009 through FFY 2012. Initially, any data reported that related in some capacity to students with disabilities and their performance on assessments was gathered for analysis. This included 618 data related to students with disabilities and their participation, performance on statewide assessments (both standard and alternate), as well as state data from the IREAD-3 assessment for the years it was available. This information was disaggregated by the individual tests (ISTEP+, IMAST, ISTAR, and IREAD-3) and shared with stakeholders through SSIP stakeholder meetings. The stakeholder group also analyzed data from prior and current State Performance Plans and Annual Performance Reports (SPP/APR).

Stakeholders were provided with raw data in regard to student results on assessments, including math and reading, as well as disaggregated data including bar graphs, pie charts and trend lines. The facilitator of the meetings led the discussion of the whole group, ensuring each stakeholder member had a common understanding of the data findings in order to understand the related needs based on these findings. The stakeholders were then asked to have conversations in small groups (each included a mix of the stakeholders, i.e. family representatives, teachers, administrators, state personnel). These conversations included discussions about potential data trends and possible implications from these trends. The discussion in both the large and small groups began with a broad analysis of the data then pointed discussion that helped to narrow the analysis process. Once the external stakeholder group had

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

analyzed the data, the information was shared with an internal stakeholder group. The discussion with the internal group included identification of the current IDOE initiatives, such as college and career readiness, RTI/MTSS, and educator effectiveness. The group consensus was that the SSIP should be tied to an existing reading initiative, specifically the emphasis on students being college and career ready through the academic lens of reading. Through these discussions, it was determined by both internal and external stakeholders that Indiana should focus on student data related to reading proficiency. The group wanted to explore other data sources for potential trends and student performance on statewide assessments in the areas of reading and English language arts. Additionally, it was discussed and determined that as a means to leverage resources and partner with internal stakeholders within IDOE, it would be necessary to disaggregate data for schools that were in focus status as determined by Indiana's Federal ESEA Flexibility Waiver. This will provide additional opportunities for the OSE to collaborate in order to meet broad strategic goals of the Department and meet the needs of all students in order to increase proficiency. Through trend analysis, a "purposeful sample group" of the schools in focus status was identified as the group for determining the State Identified Measureable Result (SIMR), for gauging potential root causes contributing to low performance, and for establishing a model of selection for the SSIP schools for the implementation in Phase III.

In addition to the extensive quantitative analysis of data which helped the stakeholder groups set an initial focal point, qualitative analysis was done as well. Leadership and Core Teams from the OSE, Title 1, and Outreach programs worked collaboratively to conduct focus group surveys of schools within the purposeful sample group. These surveys were conducted through a combination of on-site, in-person interviews with key staff members (those involved in providing reading instruction or intervention to students with disabilities at schools) in the purposeful sample group, as well as through online questionnaires with additional staff and parents. This information then was used to identify root causes that contribute to low performance in reading and English language arts.

Trend analysis of historical assessment information for all of the Indiana assessment tools were included in the data review and focused on the disaggregation of data by district: disability, placement (LRE), ethnicity, poverty (free/reduced lunch status, Title 1 eligibility), and EL status. This resulted in an abundance of both raw data and data visualizations. As one of the goals of the SSIP is to break down silos between the various IDOE departments, OSE worked closely with Title I and Outreach to collaborate on a shared vision. A purposeful sample group of buildings in focus status was developed to assist in narrowing the scope of data to review and look for common trends among similar schools. The sample was limited to schools that were identified under Indiana's Federal Accountability Waiver as schools that received a "D" or "F" school designation and are considered to be in federal school improvement status. If a school received a "D" in 2012-2013, that school was classified as a focus school in 2013-2014. In order to ensure a broad representation for root cause analysis and later scaling up, the purposeful sample group included schools from large, medium and small LEAs as well as representation from various geographical locations across the state. Through internal and external stakeholder discussions, the pros and cons of working with either "D" or "F" schools was debated. Through this debate, it was decided that in order to gather information on schools that were in need, but still had a foundational infrastructure for support, the selection for LEAs would be limited to LEAs with at least one, but less than four, focus elementary schools. The rationale used for this formula was that LEAs with greater than four focus elementary schools could limit the initial capacity for implementation in Phase III and could imply that these districts had more LEA systemic challenges that would impact building infrastructure support. A discussion also ensued as to why focus schools and not priority schools were selected for the sample group. A comment from a stakeholder (who is a parent advocate) was taken into consideration by the external stakeholders when the discussion started with the assumption that priority schools would be the target sample group. This insight shed light on the possibility that priority schools likely had many issues impacting student learning both at the school and LEA levels. The group was challenged to think about what Indiana hopes to accomplish through the SSIP and how available resources and measurable student outcomes could be affected if the challenges to the school/LEA infrastructure were massive: Would there be capacity to implement the changes? Could team structures be identified within these schools?

After substantial dialogue and debate, the stakeholder group determined that focus schools were not only in need of intervention and support, but were also likely to have the foundational infrastructure to support implementation and sustain change for the long-term. It was determined that focus schools would become the purposeful sample.

Indiana does not have issues with data quality as far as data being incomplete or incorrect. However, Indiana has experienced transition with regard to Indiana Academic Standards:

- Indiana adopted Common Core standards in 2010.
- Indiana General Assembly enacted legislation precluding Indiana's use of Common Core standards in March 2014.
- Legislation required that new College and Career Ready standards be adopted by the State Board of Education by July 1, 2014.

Subsequently, Indiana has revised its statewide assessments over the past three years. Indiana has used ISTEP+ for the regular assessment, Indiana Modified Achievement Standards Test (IMAST) for the modified assessment, and ISTAR for the alternate assessment.

IMAST was discontinued after the 2013-2014 school year, and the ISTEP+ and ISTAR assessments required revisions in order to align with the college and career ready standards. The Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Governor, and the Indiana State Board of Education continue to have conversations regarding the Indiana Academic Standards and Assessments. The impact of these transitions translates into data discrepancies between years and will impact future data comparisons. Additionally, with the elimination of the modified assessment (2% assessment, IMAST), additional students will be assessed using ISTEP+ which could impact statewide performance data. This, coupled with changes in assessment vendors, could have an impact on data reliability.

In an effort to assist with the potential for unreliable data, it was determined that IDOE will use the IREAD-3 assessment given to third grade students as the measure for student performance for the SSIP. This assessment has not been effected by the changes to standards or vendors that the standardized assessment has experienced. This will allow IDOE to identify reliable baseline measures and set realistic targets for student achievement without waiting for new data to be collected over several testing windows as the new assessment is introduced.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

It is anticipated that there will be data variability with the IREAD-3 assessment due to the fact that different third grade students are evaluated every year. The evaluation plan in Phase II will address this possible issue. Initial discussion has prompted the idea of tracking student cohorts, i.e. third grade students in year one of implementation as they advance in grades, kindergarten students who will be recipients of the coherent improvement strategies, etc.

The OSE provided trend information to the stakeholders on each of the federal indicators including both compliance and results indicators. The data was reviewed to identify possible areas of impact on the SSIP. No foreseeable issues were brought up by the external stakeholder group, however, conversation continued within the OSE. None of the data, in regard to indicators, stand out as barriers to the implementation of the SSIP. However, as the buildings begin to execute the SSIP at a local level the data will need to be analyzed specifically for any root cause possibilities. For example, if any discipline or special education identification disproportionality issues exist, the data will need to be reviewed, and local plans may need to include strategies to address the issue(s). Indicator 5, least restrictive environment (LRE), could also play a part in the coherent strategies that are put in place at a local level, adjusting service delivery and continuum options and providing training if there are issues related to LRE identified through the root cause analysis. As the implementation phase of the SSIP nears, Indiana will need to align any findings of non-compliance or any LEA outcomes that do not meet state targets for results indicators that may be present in the buildings to coherent improvement strategies and initiatives being implemented.

April 1, 2016 Phase II Submission: Revisions to Phase I

After the initial submission of Phase I of the SSIP for Indiana, there were several factors that led to the need to revisit the data analysis process and reset both baseline data and targets for the future goals of the Indiana SIMR. During the 2013-14 school year, Indiana adopted new standards, which led to a more rigorous assessment of these standards across all assessments, including the IREAD3 Assessment. This also led to an almost 10% decline in proficiency scores for the IREAD3 for all students, and subgroups of students, including those with disabilities. Given this change in standards and subsequent performance dip, it was approved by OSEP TA providers that Indiana could reset the baseline measure for the SSIP SIMR using the 2014 IREAD3 data. Additionally, the target group of students for the SIMR changed based on the State Development Network (SDN) infrastructure. The new targeted group of students, is a larger sample size of students including all students with disabilities, receiving free and reduced lunch attending elementary schools within the SDN Cohort 1. This includes sixty three elementary schools and approximately 945 students out of the 1,147 total number of third graders with disabilities in these schools. The comprehensive SSIP Stakeholder group was included in analysis of the updated data using the IREAD3 2014 data set, and the SDN 3rd grade data for students with disabilities. Stakeholders evaluated achievement gap data, and helped to determine the appropriate parameters for setting future targets based on the identified trends within the SDN student data. Stakeholders felt it was important to consider the impact of significant achievement gaps within certain racial and ethnic groups even though the data showed that across all subgroups, students receiving free/reduced lunch underperformed compared to their peers receiving paid lunch. A discrepancy in performance between students receiving free/reduced lunch and paid lunch was also shown within overall statewide data. Both of these gave support to the emphasis on Indiana's State Identified Measureable Result (SIMR) being focused on students with disabilities in the SDN schools that receive free/reduced lunch. Also within the SDN disaggregate data, African American students with disabilities receiving free/reduced lunch and paid lunch had an overall performance rate on the IREAD3 that was significantly lower than both the state average, and the performance of all other subgroups of students with disabilities within the SDN. Additionally, white students with disabilities had the largest gap of performance between students receiving paid and free/reduced lunch. The performance of these two subgroups were used as the parameters for setting the target. The overall performance of both white and African American students receiving paid lunch for this data report was used as a means of setting parameters for the overall growth target for the SSIP. Incremental growth of .5% is expected for the first years of SSIP Implementation, based on the indirect influence of practices that are being implemented both within the SDN Site schools and the primary support of the LEA participation within the State Development Network. It is expected that the students that have received SSIP Implementation support from K-3rd grade will demonstrate a significant amount of growth and this will be shown during the FFY19 IREAD3 assessment year. Additionally, it is the goal of Indiana to scale up implementation and share the lessons learned through this model both within the SDN and across the state. It is possible that growth from participation in SDN related activities or from shared professional learning around the SSIP Partnering LEAs and Site Schools will result in a greater rate of performance than anticipated.

Please refer to Appendix F-Data Analysis Update within the attached Comprehensive Manual for Implementation which includes disaggregated data used by stakeholders, as well as an explanation of the new baseline and targeted goals for improvement over Phase III

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

April 1, 2015-Submission of Phase I Report-

IDOE analyzed State infrastructure through a variety of qualitative data analysis methods. The core and leadership teams met regularly to conceive opportunities to leverage resources and to review data that reflected the state infrastructure. Additionally, members of the core team met with external stakeholder groups to garner feedback related to state infrastructure. A formal SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis process was completed (using resources and recommendations from the RRCP SWOT Analysis and State Infrastructure Analysis Toolkit) with the official SSIP Stakeholder Team and with internal IDOE staff to determine strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that would have an impact on the SIMR and SSIP relative to the state infrastructure.

There are existing supports currently available to LEAs and school personnel. The following are examples of infrastructure supports that are available for LEAs/buildings:

Indiana has a waiver from certain aspects of the federal No Child Left Behind law. This gives local schools continued flexibility in how federal funding is utilized and allows more funding decisions to be made at the local level.

The federally funded 21st Century Community Learning Centers program provides at-risk students a safe environment during non-school hours. A range of high quality services to support regular school-day academics and development are provided, including tutoring and mentoring, academic enrichment, and character education.

The "Learning Connection" is an online tool developed by IDOE that plays a prominent role in supporting the implementation of Indiana's strategic initiatives. By providing data, resources, and tools for school improvement, the functionality of the Learning Connection can be leveraged across IDOE initiatives aimed at improving student learning. The Learning Connection includes: communities for professional collaboration; a library to create lessons and school activities, a class workspace to schedule events, lessons, and learning activities; the creation of reports (individual student and class) of achievement; and a means by which

The Office of Student Services provides resources including assistance for chronic absenteeism, prevention of bullying, school climate and cultural awareness, school counseling and guidance, and military children and family resources.

Resources are provided for parents/families through different divisions within IDOE.

The Office of Special Education has the Indiana Resource Network comprised of centers that provide targeted, comprehensive support to schools across the state to improve teaching and learning:

- Over 98% of the LEAs utilize the “Indiana IEP” online to develop legally compliant Individualized Education Programs. Technical assistance and professional development for Indiana educators is offered in the development and use of procedures to ensure compliance and fidelity of IEP goal implementation.
- The Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) Resource Center increases educator knowledge and understanding of how PBIS impacts student achievement, family engagement, dropout rate and least restrictive environments.
- Project SUCCESS supports teachers and administrators in the design and implementation of Indiana Academic Standards in curriculum and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities.
- IN*SOURCE, utilizing a proven parent-to-parent model, has provided assistance, support services, and educational resources to the community of individuals and organizations that serve and support persons with disabilities.
- The PATINS Project is a statewide technical assistance network that provides accessible technology for assisting LEAs in the utilization and creation of accessible learning environments and instructional materials. A focus for the PATINS Project will include Universal Design for Learning.
- The Indiana Secondary Transition Resource Center focuses on student-focused planning activities and self-determination skill development; improved Transition IEPs and use of transition assessments; access to effective academic and life-skills instruction, quality work-based learning; interagency collaboration; and family involvement.

Detailed reports are attached that reflect the infrastructure analyses that were completed. Indiana would like to draw the reader's attention to the 'discussion' portion of the reports that provide an overview of the analyses that were completed. Also attached are two reports which detail Indiana's current strengths, the extent the systems are coordinated, and the areas for improvement within and across the systems (PDFs of SWOT Reports which detail descriptions of SWOT for each area of state infrastructure).

The Indiana Superintendent of Public Instruction has clearly laid out the IDOE initiatives as follows:

“We are dedicated to providing the highest quality of support to Indiana's schools, teachers, students and parents. We are working with educators, policy makers, business leaders, and community based organizations to achieve our mission to build an education system of high quality and equity that is focused on student-centered accountability.

The Indiana Department of Education is using a community approach to educating our children and in building support systems for our schools. No matter where children live in our state, they should enter schools that have equity in resources and the expectation they will receive a high quality education. We have established the division of Outreach for School Improvement to embrace this philosophy and approach to ensuring continuous and measurable improvement for both our students and schools.”

The Office of Special Education's new State Director of Special Education presented her goals during the keynote at a recent Indiana Inclusion Conference:

“I am passionate about the importance of growing inclusive schools. In this age of racial unrest and radical extremists, it becomes even more paramount that students are taught in schools where tolerance is expected and diversity is welcome.

We started this conversation years ago. With the onset of PL94-142, followed by IDEA... the push for mainstreaming in the 70s and the regular ed. initiative of the 80s...these all nudged schools to have students with disabilities in classrooms and buildings with their same age peers. I often wonder why after all this time we still find pockets of resistance to meeting the needs of all students without classifying some of them and separating them from the masses. Why, with all of the technology, research and highly qualified teachers do we still accept the notion that some students don't belong in a particular classroom, school or community. I guess the answer is...institutional change takes time and it takes commitment and it takes a champion or two to take risks and bring people along. My hope for all of you over the next two days is that you leave feeling confident and motivated to truly embrace all students' abilities and talents and skills, I hope you continue promoting high expectations for all students and I hope you re-dedicate your career to making a lasting change.”

As IDOE analyzed state plans that are currently in place for schools in Indiana, there are also plans that are required by schools based upon varying factors. All schools submit Schoolwide Improvement Plans; this is a required component for accreditation in an effort to assist schools in continuous strategic school improvement initiatives. Additionally, all schools with students in grades K-4 are required to submit Reading Plans. If a school is in focus or priority status, they must also submit a Student Achievement Plan. Lastly, if schools receive Title 1 funds, they must submit Title 1 Plans. The opportunity to align all of these plans with the SSIP exists. It is an expectation of IDOE that through each step of the SSIP, the cohesion and coordination of services will be aligned through these plans and initiatives. The partnership between the offices within IDOE through Outreach, Title 1, and special education, along with the current IDOE initiative to coordinate the elements of each plan into one, will allow for continuity and will reduce redundancy in schools.

As part of the final process for developing the SIMR and analyzing the state infrastructure, IDOE reviewed the SWOT Analysis reports with the SSIP stakeholder group through a formal text rendering process and discussion. This cooperative sharing experience allowed the

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

members of the formal stakeholder group to reflect on significant points from the SWOT process and to consider the various areas of the state infrastructure that could have shared strengths, weaknesses, opportunities or threats that could be either capitalized on, or developed for further planning purposes. The main standout points as far as weaknesses and opportunities that were brought to the forefront of the discussion for emphasis are in the areas of Technical Assistance/Professional Development and Data and reference the three “C’s: Capacity, Cohesion, and Communication.”

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission- Revisions to Phase I:

Following the submission of Phase I of the SSIP, the Division of School Improvement began considering additional ways to support LEAs at a district level in order to improve systemic alignment and work cohesively to address schools in need of improvement. This led to the creation of the Indiana State Development Network of districts that are committed to participating in a transformational community that is deeply focused on building an education system of high quality and equity in Title I served schools. This initiative was modeled after the State Development Network model that Indiana had been participating in at an SEA level through support of Mass Insight. The first cohort of LEAs that were able to participate in this support were selected based on their designation as Title 1 eligible districts with an intensive focus on supporting their schools that were designated as Focus or Priority Schools in need of improvement. Members of the SDN will continue to receive the following supports:

- Increased technical assistance and professional development.
- Access to IDOE experts and on-site work days
- Network of Resources including peers with similar goals and high performing districts
- Priority access on grant approval and amendments
- Assignment of a case manager to provide guidance and support
- Opportunities to participate in intensive summer professional development

The first cohort of the SDN received additional reallocated Title 1 funds and state turnaround dollars to support the implementation of a high quality district improvement plan. Professional Development and Technical Assistance support for this was offered in August 2015, and then continued on a quarterly cycle with additional follow-up support made by Case Managers on a monthly basis. Given the intentional support for school improvement that this structure provides as well as the opportunity for collaboration across all offices of the Division of School Improvement, our core team for the SSIP decided to seek the approval for the selection of schools for implementation of the SSIP to be from the SDN districts. This would allow for additional supports and cross collaboration throughout IDOE. Approval and collaboration for this partnership was received welcomingly, and this even led to an additional pilot school partner being selected from one of the Cohort I LEAs.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

April 1, 2016-Phase II Submission- Revision to Phase I:

The SIMR is based upon improving student performance in reading, which aligns to Indicator 3- student performance on statewide assessment.

The State Identified Measureable Result for Indiana:

Indiana will increase reading proficiency achievement on Indiana's IREAD-3 assessment by at least .5% each year for 3rd grade students with disabilities eligible for free/reduced lunch attending elementary schools within the State Development Network Districts.

Description

April 1, 2015- Phase I Submission:

In order to determine the SIMR, disaggregated data for reading performance by area of exceptionality, LRE, race, school lunch status, and gender were shared and displayed for the stakeholder groups to review for trend implications. A graphic representation of each of the disaggregation displays of this data is attached. The data indicated that students with language and speech impairments and specific learning disabilities in the purposeful sample group were the largest areas of exceptionalities represented. In a disaggregation of data for all students with disabilities in Indiana who did not demonstrate proficiency in passing statewide assessments in English language arts/reading, students with specific learning disabilities did not meet proficiency expectations. 77% of students with specific learning disabilities are receiving their instruction in a general education setting for 80% or more of the day, 22% receive their instruction in a resource room setting, and only 2% of those students are receiving instruction in a self-contained special education setting. When comparing the racial demographics of the purposeful sample group to their general education peers within the LEAs they reside within, the data was comparable. Therefore, there did not appear to be any implication related to race for the purposeful sample group. In both state and purposeful sample data, there are significantly more male students than female students identified with specific learning disabilities in third grade. Also significant for the development of the SIMR is the impact of poverty as related through school lunch status. 73% of the students in the purposeful sample group receive free lunch. After analyzing the graphic displays of the data and the trend implications, the stakeholders discussed how these implications could be developed as a State Identified Measureable Result. Stakeholders agreed to an initial SIMR that focused on improvement of reading outcomes for third and fourth grade male students identified with specific learning disabilities receiving free lunch. After it was determined that the most reliable measurement tool for determining baseline and targets and measuring future growth would be Indiana's IREAD-3 assessment, this further narrowed the focus to third grade students since IREAD-3 is given only to third graders.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Given the emphasis from both the state legislature and IDOE to improve college and career readiness outcomes for students in Indiana, there is a clear alignment between the Indiana SIMR and state initiatives which focuses on increasing reading outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities in third grade. The State's commitment to reading is evident in a letter below signed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction that includes an explanation of the "Hoosier Family of Readers":

"Dear Parents and Community Supporters,

During our busy days, finding time to read can be a challenge. I hope that you are able to find the time to read with the young people in your life. The Hoosier Family of Readers is an initiative to build a culture of readers in Indiana. A reading family can be any combination of caring adults and children, reading together at home, a neighborhood library or out of school at places like the Boys and Girls Club, YMCA or scouts.

We encourage all of our reading families to read anything that interests them—including graphic novels, non-fiction books, magazines, and newspapers – whether online or in print. We suggest that they:

- Read with someone
- Read to someone
- Share with someone what he/she has read
- Listen to someone read
- Help others read
- Read independently

Our Hoosier Family of Readers welcomes the Indiana National Guard as our new reading partner in Books & Boots. Active duty members of the National Guard are going to schools around Indiana to help students read and learn! We are happy to welcome them to our Hoosier Family of Readers.

If you are a member of a community group wanting to help with this reading initiative, please contact hoosierreaders@doe.in.gov (link sends e-mail) and let us know about your group and how you would like to support the Hoosier Family of Readers.

Remember, a reader is not simply someone who can read; a reader is someone who does read."

As described previously, Indiana collected and analyzed data from a number of resources, conducting both quantitative and qualitative analyses. The stakeholder groups, during the initial presentation of information, engaged in thoughtful and deliberate discussion which resulted in the collection of further data and analysis. The new information was then analyzed along with the initial information, and the stakeholder groups ultimately crafted the SIMR.

It is Indiana's belief that the student centered outcome has been evident in all elements of the first phase of the SSIP. The stakeholder groups keep the focus of all conversations on the student who is learning. This has been evident through the focused work of student centered outcomes achieved by breaking down silos, including parents, teachers, Title 1, Outreach, Assessment, and Accountability. The students are the center of the work. A tool that has been developed for use by the administrators of the pilot and implementation buildings (to begin in Phase II) that lists each target student individually and the various 'categories' of support that are available to that student either through a funding source or building/LEA initiative. The tool also lists the individual student results on assessments to ensure that there is a baseline of information for measurement purposes.

Indiana chose the SIMR using a deliberate and intentional method of selection focusing first on leveraging the IDOE-wide reading initiative to ensure that the office of special education was supporting those efforts for students with disabilities being implemented as 'students' first. To support these students, Indiana followed the guidance offered through the OSEP funded technical assistance centers, the various conference calls, webinars and technical assistance opportunities: "start small and scale up".

Though an argument could be made to focus on any particular group of students with disabilities, Indiana chose to concentrate on a group of students in a disability category with a higher incidence in the state. In order to effectively partner with various divisions within the IDOE, the OSE looked to partner with Title I and Outreach. Those divisions were already working with the focus and priority schools, and when the data was reviewed, it was found that the male students with specific learning disabilities were a group that needed assistance. With the selection of the SIMR based on impact of students with the highest incidence disability category in both the purposeful sample group and in the state, it provides an opportunity to implement evidence-based practices for improving outcomes that can be scaled up to a group that is also affected at a state level and has overall impact on state data and performance.

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission- Revisions to Phase I

The SSIP is part of a larger IDOE initiative through the State Development Network. This partnership focuses on struggling learners as a whole. Due to this emphasis, stakeholders reviewed additional data and determined that the SIMR should include a broader student demographic group instead of the original focus on male students with specific learning disabilities.

Please review the attached Comprehensive Manual for Implementation-IN-SSIP for additional explanation.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

10/31/2017

Page 55 of 60

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission- Revisions to Phase I:

During the initial phases of SSIP development, IDOE established an Instructional Practices Advisory Committee to identify the evidence-based instructional strategies within early literacy instruction, as well as high-leverage practices that, when applied across content, improve student learning. This group met on multiple occasions, under the direction of the IDOE with support from the National Center on Systemic Improvement, to collaboratively review the research and identify the evidence-based and high-level instructional strategies that, if applied with fidelity, will most likely improve student literacy performance. Likewise, this group considered how to purposefully align SSIP work to the existing requirements and support under the SDN. For example, the SSIP specifically focused on leadership capacity to support both school turn around and inclusive school cultures. Furthermore, and most impressive, the team connected ongoing school turnaround efforts to review and revise the state's RTI guidance and align it with the framework for Multi-tiered Systems of Support. MTSS will be supported by the SSIP team using the work of the department as a guideline. As demonstrated within the SSIP logic model, MTSS establishes the infrastructure to both promote school turn around efforts and the implementation of evidence-based and high-leverage practices with fidelity. A complete listing of the advisory committee's menu of approved instructional practices can be found within Appendix C of the Comprehensive Manual for Implementation.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

☒ Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission- Revisions to Phase I:

The Theory of Action developed during Phase I was revised by the Indiana SSIP Core Team based on OSEP guidance and input from Stakeholders and the National Center for Systemic Improvement to ensure that the clear articulation of coherent improvement activities and roles of each layer of the infrastructure from State Education Agency to Local Education Agency to building leader to teacher was clearly identified.

A Logic Model and alignment document was also developed during Phase II to further clarify specific activities, and short, medium, and long term measures of success.

Indiana would like to thank the staff from the federally funded National Center for Systemic Improvement and their collaborative TA partners that have spent the year assisting the Indiana SSIP Core Team in ensuring the process was both deliberate and focused and that IDOE met the goals and requirements outlined by OSEP.

Infrastructure Development

- (a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
- (d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission:

Indiana has been intentionally focused on systems alignment from the State Education Agency level cascading through to the LEA and school levels. Within the Indiana Department of Education(IDOE), systems alignment work has been supported through an organizational change, combining all offices focused on school improvement, including the Office of Special Education under one division. The directors of each office within the Division meet and will continue to meet weekly as a leadership team to work toward common goals guided by the IDOE Strategic Plan. The offices are now sharing and will continue to share the SSIP work as well as other initiatives. This cross office collaboration led to the creation of the State Development Network (SDN) focused on increasing capacity at the district level for LEAs and system alignment for LEAs. Additionally, this collaboration has led to forming multiple task forces focused on initiatives such as the development of a task force within IDOE to begin work on reviewing and revising current RTI guidance to align with the framework for Multi-tiered Systems of Support and a task force to provide statewide recognition for schools implementing successful "Promising Practices". These activities all demonstrate a quilting of silos at the state level to support improved practices and overall student outcomes at the local level.

The new organizational structure within IDOE will ensure ongoing communication and problem solving among offices. The common goal of school improvement encompasses the SSIP work. The IDOE website provides numerous resources which will allow for sustainable support for the SSIP at both the universal and targeted levels. Additionally, the collaborative work among offices will provide structure for future scaling up outside of the SDN. The established special education Indiana Resource Network (IRN) will meet quarterly to plan the provision of PD and TA to the SSIP schools focusing on instructional support of students with disabilities. Finally, planned TA to SDN site schools will provide sustainable support for the implementation of the identified coherent improvement strategies that align specifically to the SDN site schools participating in the SSIP.

Currently in Indiana, all schools are required to complete School Improvement Plans (SIP).Those schools identified as priority or focus schools are required to complete Student Achievement Plans (SAP). In addition, all elementary schools in Indiana are required to submit Reading Plans that identify the reading instruction and targets for supporting students at risk. Finally, the State Development Network (SDN) requires that all districts participating in this initiative complete a High Quality Plan (HQP) identifying systemic alignment and improvement activities. Each of these plans focus on how to improve student outcomes, including outcomes for students with disabilities.

As a means to leverage and align the current required plans (HQP, SIP, SAP, and Reading Plans) with the SSIP work, site schools will be required to include goals that are focused on professional development, technical assistance, and evidenced based practices for instruction that will be implemented to improve outcomes for students with disabilities and struggling learners. The work to ensure continuity among all plans will be a focal point of the SSIP support provided to schools and LEAs.

The infrastructure changes to support the SSIP have already begun within the structure of the State Development Network. The LEAs that agree to be Partnering LEAs and designate site schools for SSIP implementation will have additional requirements for aligning all plans, and maximizing the additional SDN funding in part or whole to support this work. A core group of Directors and Specialists from various Offices within the Division of School Improvement will meet frequently to assess the need for additional changes in infrastructure.

The IDOE MTSS task force has submitted the final recommendations for guidance and this initiative is currently in its final stages of planning. The goal for introducing the MTSS framework, website launch and additional Professional Development Summits are still in the planning and approval stages. It is not certain when the IDOE supported MTSS Initiative will be launched. However, support for MTSS as an Evidence Based Practice will continue to be a foundation of the SSIP site school work.

Capacity building for systemic alignment within the SDN and site schools has also already begun. The LEAs have participated in intentionally planned PD for the district level staff focused on Data, Leadership and Instruction. The SSIP Instructional Practices Advisory Council has identified common language competencies and will present these to the Indiana Resource Network (IRN) providers to ensure that all SSIP schools are receiving the same guidance and support to improve outcomes as planning for implementation occurs.

The structure of the Indiana Department of Education allows for an easier collaboration among offices. IDOE is divided into two structures to support schools. These are the Division of School Improvement, and the Division of Support Services. The members of the Core Team for the implementation of the SSIP include members from the Office of Special Education, Office of Outreach, Office of Early Learning and School Improvement Grants. Each

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

of these offices is included in the Division for School Improvement and report to the Assistant Superintendent for Division of School Improvement. These members bring a diverse perspective that helps to support the goals of the SSIP. Additionally, the Key Advisors to the SSIP Core Team include members from the State Development Network Districts, the Leadership Team for all of the offices within the Division of School Improvement, the Case Managers for the SDN Districts, College and Career Ready Office, Early Learning and Intervention Office, the Indiana Resource Network providers, and the pilot school within the SDN. Additional extended participants include representatives from the fiscal offices within Part B, Title 1 and state funds, the Executive Team for the Department of Education, parent support network, and individual Outreach Coordinators, the Special Education Advisory Council, the Indiana Council of Administrators, general and special education teachers, members from the Office of Student Assessment, and members from the Office of Accountability. Members from both the key advisors and feedback networks participate in formal and informal stakeholder meetings and will provide varying levels of support to improve the state infrastructure. Stakeholders have been involved in the development of specific plans and support for implementation through their involvement on the SSIP Stakeholder committee, or Instructional Practices Advisory Council. Many of these same members have also been involved in the development of the MTSS statewide supports, and are also supporting systemic alignment within the State Development Networks. Through the evaluation of implementation and measures of student's outcomes, varying members will continue to participate in providing feedback to the SSIP during Phase III.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

- (a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
- (c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

April 1, 2016- PHASE II Submission:

The support for implementation of the evidence based practices is embedded in several tiers. In the first tier, LEAs within the State Development Network (SDN) will receive guidance and professional development focused on system alignment and evidence based practices to support all eight *Turnaround Principles*. Each LEA is provided a Case Manager who completes monthly check in calls highlighting specific systemic alignment practices and Turnaround Principles. The Case Managers also assist with providing resources and technical assistance to guide their implementation of the district wide High Quality Plan (HQP).

In the second tier, LEAs with SSIP site schools will receive additional intensive technical assistance to develop and align district goals and implementation planning within the district High Quality Plan (HQP), School Improvement Plan (SIP) or Student Achievement Plan (SAP) and Reading Plan. The SDN districts will meet quarterly with IDOE staff and additional resource providers to receive intentional and targeted PD to support the development and coordination of systemic alignment. Each PD session provided to the SDN offers Evidence Based Practices (EBPs) for district improvement in three key *Turnaround Principles*: Leadership, Data, and Instruction.

In the third tier of support, site schools within the SDN will receive the most intensive assistance for implementation of the SSIP. They will receive technical assistance for MTSS implementation beginning during the 2016-17 SY, and assistance developing and aligning their district HQP to specific areas of Root Cause within their individual schools. The site schools will receive an on-site visit focused on determining potential areas of root cause for poor reading achievement outcomes for students with disabilities and struggling learners. During the Root Cause Analysis on-site visit, classroom observations during reading instruction in grades K-3 will be completed, along with interviews of all providers of reading instruction, or reading interventions. This visit will be followed up with the building leaders completing a Partner's Inventory aligned to the *Turnaround Principles* with district level administrator support. The findings from this visit will be shared with school and district level staff via a formal report with recommendations aligned to the areas of root cause and the menu of EBPs that were identified as high leverage practices by the Instructional Practices Advisory Council for the SSIP. Coordinated technical assistance and professional development will be embedded within all the district and school required plans based on these recommendations and LEA and school leader decisions.

IDOE used a group of stakeholders, (Instructional Practices Advisory Committee) to review the Evidence Based Practices (EBPs) that were identified by the National Center for Systemic Improvement as "high leverage" practices for addressing the areas of root cause that were identified during PHASE I. Additionally, all of these practices were evaluated based on their capacity to meet the needs of all students, including those with disabilities or struggling to learn, by upholding rigorous academic standards and high expectations for all. These practices were in support of improving quality reading instruction, improving early literacy instruction, and increasing high expectations within leaders and teachers for students with disabilities and struggling learners. Additional research for best practices was provided for systemic alignment, and Multi-tiered Systems of Support. The Instructional Practices Advisory Council (IPAC), included experts from IDOE in the area of Reading, Early Learning, Outreach, and Special Education, as well as outside experts in the area of PBIS, UDL and Inclusive Practices. This team reviewed each practice and selected practices based on their alignment to the areas of needs, potential for successful implementation and support for improving outcomes for students with disabilities with regard to the Indiana's State Identified Measurable Result (SiMR). It was determined through the activities of the pilot school that providing a menu of these practices within the Root Cause Analysis (RCA) visit report that align specifically to the needs of the school would allow for individual school autonomy and would address possible adaptive challenges.

The following bulleted points identify the requisite Implementation Drivers or the key components of capacity building and infrastructure development that will influence successful implementation of the SSIP in Indiana. These are the core components needed to initiate and support classroom, building, and district level change. These have been identified as possible drivers that may vary depending on the individual needs of the districts, schools, and classrooms that are participating in the SSIP. The SSIP Core team within each site school will evaluate their planning for implementation and individual selection of EBPs against the Implementation Driver rubric. Identified levels of support for implementation within each driver for the selected EBPs will be contingent on the specific site school needs and this evaluation process. These drivers will be evaluated after the completion of the RCA visit report, and during the development of the HQP and site school's SIP and Reading Plans.

- Competency Drivers:
 - Recruitment/Selection of Staff (within current school infrastructure or outside, coaches, leaders, etc.) to utilize EBPs
 - Training needs for staff around use of EBPs
 - Coaching needs to support implementation and fidelity of EBPs use
 - Performance and Assessment of Fidelity of implementation of EBPs
- Organization Drivers:
 - Decision/ Support Data Systems that will ensure outcomes of implementation, both with regard to fidelity of implementation, and students outcomes related to the selected EBPs
 - Facilitative Administrative Supports needed for EBPs (implementation team structure, policies and procedures, use/utilization of data to inform work, reduction of barriers)
 - Systems Intervention, what is needed to address barriers within the system for implementation of the EBPs, protocols, and leadership capacity
- Leadership Drivers:
 - Technical Leadership needs related to the implementation of selected EBPs (reasons for changes, guidance for expectations and clarity about what needs to be done)
 - Adaptive Leadership needs with alignment of the implementation of selected EBPs to the goals, vision and mission of the LEA, and school, and levels of communication to meet needs of staff.

In order to provide the TA/PD needed to support the implementation of the EBPs that a site school has selected, IDOE will work collaboratively with the Key Advisors to identify which supports would align best to the selected EBPs and RCA needs as well as the evaluation of the Drivers for Implementation of those EBPs selected. The additional TA/PD required to support the selected EBP will be provided in combination by the Indiana Resource Network staff, or possibly by an outside PD provider if this is appropriate. See the Menu of Evidence Based Practices found in Appendix B of the Comprehensive Manual for Implementation. IDOE will provide support to the site school SSIP teams for planning and ongoing implementation evaluation. IDOE SSIP Core Team members will participate in monthly SDN and SSIP calls with site schools to ensure effective implementation of all plans that support SSIP goals.

As a part of the SSIP implementation process, regular evaluation of the Partnering LEAs and SSIP site schools' plans and practices will be reviewed. As progress with implementation drivers is made, additional scaling up of the practices will be supported. Additionally, information regarding the outcomes of these practices will be shared within the SDN and also through the Promising Practices- Making It Happen initiative as a means to encourage non-SDN LEAS/ schools to consider these practices as a means to improve outcomes for all students.

Please see the attached Comprehensive Manual for Implementation- IN-SSIP- specific steps and tools that will be used during each step of implementation can be found within this comprehensive manual.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) Evaluation

- (a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
- (b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- (c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
- (d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

April 1, 2016- PHASE II Submission:

Indiana has utilized the Leading by Convening tools for engaging stakeholders. Specifically identifying circles of participation and potential roles that various stakeholders can play in the Indiana SSIP. It is through these tools that additional stakeholders have continued to be identified and will continue to be identified as the SSIP plan begins to move into Phase III within the partner LEAs and site schools involved in the SSIP. The large group feedback network identified as the SSIP Stakeholder Committee has met quarterly during Phase I and Phase II of the SSIP implementation process. Members of this group were initially invited to participate during Phase I as representatives of various education organizations, parent support organizations, IDOE departments, and education related roles. Members have continued to be added as the planning has evolved during Phase II. It is planned that this large group will continue to meet quarterly either in person or virtually in order to review and gather evaluation feedback for Phase III of implementation. As evidenced in the visual display of the Indiana SSIP Circles of Participation, varying stakeholders are part of this feedback network and also play other roles.

Implementation and outcomes will be measured with data sources including interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders; professional development and meetings; review of process documents and records including professional development material; school demographic data; student performance results including benchmark assessments, and results on state standardized tests.

During the infrastructure analysis conducted in Phase I and development of the TOA, Indiana identified the SDN as an existing initiative that will be used to support the collection of data related to implementation of EBPs and the impact on student performance. Indiana reviewed data extensively to determine SSIP sample group within the SDN is representative of the state population. This data will continue to be reviewed, with the support of an external evaluator, to ensure consistency. Each time data is collected, the criteria will be analyzed according to short, medium and long term outcomes. In addition, current SDN protocols used for data collection are being reviewed and aligned to accurately reflect the data collection requirements of the SSIP and SIMR.

The SSIP process and intended outcomes will be continuously evaluated throughout implementation. Feedback loops were carefully designed to reflect the Theory of Action and align with the Logic Model to provide a framework to evaluate, reflect and inform course corrections.

Within the feedback loop, Indiana has included evidence collection at each stage to ensure active monitoring and successful implementation. For each evidence stage, Indiana is collecting documentation such as materials, agendas, and evaluations of engagement and is developing tools for collecting data related to implementation fidelity and outcomes. This type of evidence will be collected throughout technical assistance and professional development related to RCA, District Data Review, and EBPs. In addition, rubrics and protocols are being developed to guide coaching, classroom observation and impact of implementation of EBPs. As evidence is collected, it will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of professional development, fidelity of implementation, and impact on student performance. Indiana will continuously monitor and make appropriate adjustments to SSIP to reflect feedback and data.

Please see attached Comprehensive Implementation Manual which includes graphics and descriptions of various steps within the Evaluation Process.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

April 1, 2016- Phase II Submission:

IDOE leveraged the assistance from the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) and other federally funded TA Centers throughout SSIP Phase I and II development and initial implementation as follows:

- Participation in bi-weekly to monthly check in calls to: 1) discuss timelines, tools, and resources to support SSIP development and implementation; 2) deliberate outstanding or emerging questions concerning the SSIP; 3) identify areas where support is needed; 4) problem solve specific issues or emerging barriers/challenges; 5) identify opportunities to collaborate and coordinate with other TA providers and/or states.
- Guidance - including modeling - of facilitated activities to secure broad stakeholder engagement and input into the analysis and design of SSIP recommendations. Specifically in the identification and selection of the evidence-based practices prioritized within SSIP strategies.
- Participation in NCSI's Systems Alignment Cross State Learning Collaborative and the subsequent virtual meetings to support Indiana efforts to align school turn around/improvement efforts and the SSIP. Specific support in IDOE's logic model and theory of action.
- Guidance and support in the SiMR revisions and related benchmarks.
- Identification of evidence-based literacy instruction, high-leverage instructional strategies, and leadership school turn around strategies, via a NCSI technical assistance response.
- Identification of existing observation rubrics assessing literacy instruction, via a NCSI technical assistance requests.
- Coordinated discussion between IDOE and the South Carolina Department of Education to facilitate collaboration and coordination concerning the modification of IDC's Success Gap Rubric to meet comparable SSIP approaches.
- Identification of universally available tools and resources to support preservice and in-service professional learning in the identified evidence-based practices (e.g. CEEDAR Early Reading Innovation Configurations and Course Enhancement Modules).

IDOE plans to continue this level of collaboration and coordination with NCSI as follows:

- Consult and problem solve on strategies to advance and monitor fidelity of implementation at both the SEA and LEA levels.
- Development and refinement of the co-drafted literacy instruction observation rubric from the CEEDAR and NCSI Center.
- Training concerning the use of the literacy observation rubric and/or CEEDAR's K-5 Reading Instruction Course Enhancement Module, as needed and requested.
- Continued participation in the Systems Change Cross State Learning Collaborative. As desired, participation in the Literacy Cross State Learning Collaborative.
- Continued guidance concerning data collection toward benchmarks and targets.

Additionally, IDOE intends to utilize the strong infrastructure of Stakeholder engagement and participation established for the Indiana SSIP and identified in Appendix E of the Comprehensive Manual for Implementation of the IN-SSIP. That said, the IDOE SSIP Team Leader will develop a schedule for regular check in calls, virtual and/or face to face meetings with the national and Indiana Resource Network TA providers, SDN Case Managers, and Partnering LEAs/Site School SSIP Teams to ensure technical assistance activities are aligned with expectations within the SSIP and being provided as needed to support the plans of the Partnering LEAs. This communication will also allow for opportunities to leverage all available TA resources to provide the type of professional learning and support needed to strengthen teacher and leader practice. These meetings will involve monthly/bi-monthly

10/31/2017 Page 58 of 60

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

progress/status reports from each respective TA Center as well as SSIP Partnering LEA and Site Schools. These reports will demonstrate the centers' purposeful alignment and support of the SSIP.

FFY 2015 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Nancy Zemaitis

Title: Assistant Director, IDOE/OSE

Email: nzemaitis@doe.in.gov

Phone: 317-232-0568